



LAVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2016 - 2031

CONSULTATION STATEMENT Volume III: Verbatim Pre-Submission Consultation Responses

Lavant Parish Council

December 2016

029LAVANT NEIGHHOORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

RESPONSES TO PRE-SUBMISSION DOCUMENT: 10TH March – April 28th 2016

Question 1a: Has this pre-submission draft document identified the importance of living in Lavant?

Question 1b: Overall do you support the ideas and policies of this doc?

Question 2: Have you noticed any key omissions or inaccuracies?

Question 3: Do you have any other comments relating to any of the supporting documents?

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
001	14/03/16	R	Q1a Q1b Q2 LNDP 9	Yes An excellent piece of work – well done to all involved, and thank you for doing it on behalf of us all Sites (9) might be clearer if the potential number of properties on each site were stated up front With more and more people working from home these days (including myself), it would be good to include office/work space in some of the new properties. Having to take clients to an upstairs spare bedroom office is not ideal!	Comment Noted Comment noted. This has been discussed by the SG before the pre-submission draft was published and the SG concluded that it would be inappropriate to make such specifications. As a result no change has been made.
002	14/03/16	Paul Sansby Portsmouth Water		Thank you for the link to the pre submission draft of the Lavant Plan. We do not have any specific comments about the policies proposed or the overall plan. The housing sites are all close to existing mains but when they come forward for development the capacity of the system will need to be checked. Any off site reinforcements will be paid for by the developer. Portsmouth water is actively managing the biodiversity of its sites at Lavant Pumping station and Lavant Reservoir. In association with the Environment Agency, Natural England and the South Downs National Park, Portsmouth Water runs the South Downs Clean Water Partnership. This aims to improve water quality within the catchment through a range of measures including working with farmers and other land owners.	Comment noted. NAR.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
003	14/03/16	Stephanie Evans Environ. Coordinator CDC	LDNP 22 LDNP 26 BOA LDNP 21 LDNP 24	<p>Thank you for inviting comments on the LNP, my comments are provided below and are with reference to biodiversity. I'm very supportive of the inclusion of the Lavant Biodiversity Opportunity Area within the Neighbourhood Plan. However since the sites LDNP 22 and LDNP 26 actually sit within the BOA, it would be good if reference could be made to the BOA within the site specific policies. A- For example: "the site sits within the Lavant Watershed Biodiversity Opportunity Area and therefore opportunities to enhance the habitat along the Lavant/within the BOA should be maximised".</p> <p>Also the hedges/trees surrounding sites LDNP 21 and 24, fall within the Chichester Bat Network (are thought to be used by commuting bats) and therefore, where possible, should be retained and enhanced.</p>	<p>Wording added to LNDP22: "the site sits within the Lavant Watershed Biodiversity Opportunity Area and therefore opportunities to enhance the habitat along the Lavant/within the BOA should be optimised.</p> <p>LNDP26 has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p> <p>Covered by National Policies.</p>
004	14/03/16	Mark Hoult Agent		<p>I acknowledge receipt of your email. I am somewhat shocked that, despite the presentations and meetings which my late father, Derek Hoult and I attended at the behest of the Lavant Development Committee there has been no follow up discussion with us at all.</p> <p>I am also highly surprised at the twice repeated comment in the draft report. "The owner's Agent has expressed a clear intention to develop this site." This is completely incorrect. I am the owner's agent and I have said no such thing, either to the Committee or anyone else.</p> <p>We spent a considerable amount of money asking consultants to draw up an illustrative scheme so that the Committee and the SDNP would see the benefits of developing the site, as part of the SDNP planning process. The draft report includes this document. I am very disappointed that the Committee has completely ignored the</p>	<p>The LPC regrets the unfortunate misunderstanding that arose. The site has not been considered but and is not considered suitable for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan. Please refer to the Assessment of Potential Development Sites within the evidence base.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				purpose of this document and chosen to misrepresent our point of view in such an antagonistic fashion. I should be grateful if this glaring error would be corrected.	
005	23/03/16	R	1a 1b LNDP 12 LDNP 26 Site 14	Yes Yes Patch of land in front of St Mary's Church to be designated a Community Asset affording historic views of Grade 1 listed St Mary's. Agree with site re-develop <u>BUT</u> in keeping with scale & character of houses in East Lavant – give proper space to houses – 8 will be too dense PLEASE NOTE – allow <u>space</u> between houses and boundaries. Design a style to reflect the area.	Noted/ NAR already identified as a Local Green Space. And listed in Community Matters Doc page 11. Does not meet the criteria for Community Asset. This site(14) has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016
006	23/03/16	R	1a 1b 3	Yes Yes The research has been well executed and the conclusions make an excellent case for the chosen solutions. Well done to the team for their efforts.	Comment noted. NAR.
007	15/03/16	John Slipper Lavant Allot. Association		How this document should be used 1:12: "everyone should pay attention to the aspirations and <u>objectives</u> set out within this document" <u>Should read objectives not objections.</u> <u>Consultation process</u> 1:16: The series of approaches had a bias towards informing; "tell" as opposed to "asking" residents. Strengths and weaknesses 1:18: "Business units are out of date, under occupied" – because the site owner sees it as a brown field housing development opportunity and has deliberately encouraged reduced tenancy occupation. "Not suitable for modern businesses" – Lavant needs a mixture of employment, not much point in	Agreed, should read <i>objectives</i> not objections. Amendment made Comment noted. Comment noted re Eastmead Estate.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			<p>LOB 8</p> <p>LOB 9</p>	<p>encouraging low cost housing if <u>all</u> the future work opportunities are office biased high-tech. Lavant Chichester and England still require local practical works to be undertaken.</p> <p>“Local Primary school at capacity” is not a weakness, over or under its capacity would be.</p> <p>“The main community facility (Memorial Hall) is based well away from the bulk of housing”. It is not necessary a weakness owing to community use and support of this asset.</p> <p><u>At the First Open Meeting (October 2013)</u></p> <p>What we learnt 2.09 Protecting green space was a priority for many in our community</p> <p>Very disappointed with <u>how few green spaces</u> of value have been identified, we can and need to add more;</p> <p>One could be the <u>wide green area between St Nicholas church</u> and the entrance to St Nicholas Road.</p> <p>Objectives are:</p> <p>LOB8 Protect specified local open and green spaces valued and/or used by the local community.</p> <p>LOB9 Encourage the provision of new open and green spaces for sporting and general social/recreational use by the community.</p> <p><u>6.0 COMMUNITY SPACES & FACILITIES</u></p> <p>6.01 LNDP 10 – Local Green Space</p> <p>6.05 LNDP 11 – Local Community Space</p> <p>An awareness of how to add resources to community space to enable a re-designation to green space should be undertaken.</p> <p>Looking at 6.07 (Document 9 Ref: 11) as community space for enhancement.</p> <p><u>Create a mini wild flower</u> area running to the northern boundary.</p> <p>When this site was considered suitable for a community shop no allowance was made for the loss of a mature ash tree. West Sussex County Council felled the tree because it was judged to be unsafe</p>	<p>Comment noted and agreed. Add balancing Strength: <i>Memorial Hall supported by Community.</i></p> <p>Comments noted. This space reassessed as it is considered that there is close proximity to community it serves and is demonstrably special. Currently this space is proposed to be allocated as a Local Community Space (LNDP11).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This policy concerns the allocation of land as Local Community Space. This will be considered and potentially be included in the Community Matters Doc as an aspiration.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			<p>LNDP 10 LNDP 11</p> <p>LDNP 25</p> <p>Doc 5 p50</p>	<p>due to disease. Eventually they have got round to replacing it with a local species (oak). This tree should not be confused with the numerous recent planting of what look like, copper beach</p> <p>6.01 LNDP 10 – Local Green Space 6.05 LNDP 11 – Local Community Space</p> <p>An awareness of how to add resources to community space to enable a re-designation to green space should be undertaken. Looking at 6.07 (Document 9 Ref: 11) as community space for enhancement.</p> <p><u>9.0 SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES</u></p> <p>LDNP 25 9.14 Parking access issues</p> <p>This site has desperate issues with access and parking for the local residents. It has been well documented to the PC when the once a fortnight Sunday services are held there. If it was changed to a 7 day week facility, the vehicle movement associated with this would be untenable for the local residents.</p> <p>The Chichester Diocese could consider what other useful services a redundant church building could perform for our wider society. Shelter for the homeless or even a refugee centre would not present access issues.</p> <p>Stage Two Assessment (Document 5 page 50) 2:1 & 2:2 The Yew tree (north east of the building) is probably the oldest living thing in the settlement boundary. It would have been in place before the earliest church on the site and warrants special protection.</p>	<p>The Site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Parish Council November 2016</p> <p>Discussions were been held with the Chichester Diocese who are supportive of a Community Hub facility. This has been mentioned on numerous occasions during the consultation on the NP. The existing building is not considered to be redundant; but underused.</p> <p>The Yew tree will by virtue of it being located within the Conservation Area enjoy special protection. NAR</p>
008	23/03/16	R	6.00	<p><u>COMMENT 1</u></p> <p>- 6.00 Community Spaces and Facilities - Key View 2 Lavant Down Road – why has this not been classed a green protected space?</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LDNP 23	<p>- Green Protected spaces My comment regarding the strip of green open space along the Northern side of Lavant Down Road. This has been classed as a Local Community Space, and not as a protected Green space in the LDNP, BUT.....I strongly believe <u>it should be a Protected Green Space. It fits into the criteria of one i.e.....</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Local, natural, rural beauty</u> that is specifically <u>characteristic of Lavant</u> as a village at the foot of the South Downs. - Tranquil, <u>nature-filled walk</u> with hedgerows, trees, cows and horse, farmer's field that reflects the season, <u>dark skies</u>, and fresh healthy air, <u>with space</u>. b- A key, <u>breath-taking view</u> of the South Downs National Park....<u>HISTORIC VIEW</u> - It is one of the quietest, unspoiled tranquil walks. Popular with local walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, and those seeking some respite from cars, buildings and the confinement from our "man-made" environments. - It is abundant with wildlife, wonderful for dark skies, as well as amazing daylight ones. - <u>Please protect</u> this valuable green space. We need it for our health and sanity as more and more of these areas that are easily accessible to local people, many of whom do not have cars, and may have disabilities that prevent them getting out into distant nature, are becoming targets for "space filling projects". (Green spaces are our <u>LUNGS</u>.) <p>It is a walk and a view of nature at its most <u>beautiful, and simply natural</u>, where we can <u>BREATHE</u> spaciousness, and tranquillity.</p> <p><u>COMMENT 2</u> Eastmead Industrial Estate (EIE) Gaston Way</p>	<p>This particular space has been assessed (See evidence base document <i>A Review Of Open Spaces In And Around Lavant</i>). Currently this space is proposed to be allocated as a Local Community Space (LDNP11).</p> <p>Noted/NAR</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>- This area is dense in buildings, concrete, and parked cars, as well as a source of (potential)pollution due to the Industrial Character of (EIE)</p> <p>- It occurred to me, that with an already overcrowded environment in Gaston Way and along Yarbrook Cottages, due to the great number of vehicles, both cars and vans, belonging to residents and their visitors, that some of the Industrial Estate could be made into landscaped car-parking for some of these vehicles.</p> <p>If the Eastmead Industrial Estate has potential danger from contamination of Industrial pollutants, then paving over, rather than digging up, may reduce any problems from such.</p> <p>Rows of vans and cars, half on pavement and grass verges and lining roads, detract from a rural village quality, and if there is space nearby that could be used for the overflow, then it seems good sense to use it.</p> <p>- A walkway could be made for access to Gaston Way</p> <p>- It concerns me that a potential road has been mentioned between the Industrial Estate and Gaston Way....</p> <p>- Gaston Way is a <u>narrow, residential, road</u>. I do not think it wise to create a rat-run here, nor allow vehicles using the Industrial Estate – such as lorries, vans, delivery vehicles to invade a quiet peaceful environment. Please protect us humans!</p> <p>- I am also concerned, when the term “<u>light industrial</u>” potential usage for the Eastmead Industrial Estate is mentioned. Being close to a residential area, the infrastructure, possible pollution from <u>noise, sewage</u>, and the nature of the Industry, all raise serious</p>	<p>This idea has potential, as the working hours car park could become residential out of working hours.</p> <p>Noted/NAR Remediation is a matter for the experts, and will be covered in any planning application.</p> <p>Noted/NAR Repeat of point above</p> <p>Already Part of the policy Noted/NAR</p> <p>Noted Split first bullet point into separate sentences. <i>Add to new bullet point ‘ and be integrated with the immediate surroundings ‘</i></p> <p>NAR Type of usage would be covered in planning application, but no increase from today’s permitted should be allowed</p> <p>Comment noted and sentiments agreed LNDP Vision statement reflects this view. NAR</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>health and environmental issues, as well as the already acknowledged danger from contaminated old buildings and land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are needing to “clean up” our environments, and learn from past mistakes but we need to be careful how we do it, and what we create new. <p><u>c- COMMENT 3</u> <u>GOODWOOD AIRFIELD NOISE POLLUTION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I have recently spoken with the manager, Mr Gibb, regarding the noise from the low-flying aircraft, which at times become unbearably numerous and loud. - I noticed there was a mention of their shortcutting across Lavant Village on the LNDP website - He assured me they generally stick to the correct routes, but I am not convinced about this: are such routes beneficial to Lavant residents anyway? - They become inhumanely noisy and frequent at certain times, and I feel utterly helpless to take the matter any further as a single resident. - I would welcome some support in this matter from others, residents and council. <p><u>d- REGARDING DEVELOPMENTS, AIR QUALITY AND DRAINAGE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please note that the closely and densely “built-up” nature of the Industrial and residential area to the (immediate) south of Lavant Down Road, is in the <u>Lavant Valley</u>. It is <u>low lying</u>, and does not benefit from a free flow of air between properties (which would blow pollutants away). - In Potnore, I am already polluted from coal fire smoke for days and weeks during cold weather, as well as from bonfire smoke from neighbours throughout the year. Laundry, and Household product perfumes, and garden chemicals, pollute the air, as well as vehicle 	<p><u>COMMENT 3</u> LPC has regular meetings with Goodwood. Noise is covered under National Planning Policies. Comment noted, NAR.</p> <p><u>REGARDING DEVELOPMENTS, AIR QUALITY AND DRAINAGE</u> Comment noted, NAR.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>fumes, and farm pollutants. They don't blow away easily due to this valley environment, and closely placed properties.</p> <p>- <u>Air quality, and the nature of the valley</u> need taking into consideration, for humans, as well as wildlife, when planning any developments in these northern areas of mid-Lavant.</p> <p>- <u>Drainage</u> The strip of green space on the Northern side of Lavant Down Road – has <u>very poor drainage</u>. <u>The sewers</u> in this area have problems, and one winter, a <u>pumping lorry</u> there for weeks, day and night!</p> <p>Thank you</p>	
009	17/03/16	Lucy Thomson Lavant House Stables	Q1a Q1b LNDP 18	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>New Public rights of way. Whilst provision is being made for walkers and cyclists there is no mention of provision for horse riders in the LNDP, despite there being a huge population of horses kept in the West Lavant area. The only bridleways currently in the Lavant Parish are located in East Lavant which means the majority of horse riders have to cross/ride along the A286 to access this route. Extremely unsafe for riders, cars and pedestrians.</p>	As a consequence of recent trial regarding Centurion Way, involvement of LPC/CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL/SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY and considerable public interest (including Public Meeting held in Sept 2016). Modify wording of Policy Second paragraph to read' <i>to provide new <u>public rights of way</u>.....</i> '
010	16/03/16	Lavant WI		Thank you for sending me details of the Presubmission draft document for the Lavant parish Council Neighbourhood Plan. It is very interesting to read it, but I don't feel that it would have any impact on the WI.	Comment noted.
011 CR1 – transcribed by CR	At St Nicholas	R	Q1a Q1b Site 14 Site 13	<p>Yes. The draft pre submission is in line with the views of the above with good consideration for the issues associated with each site.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Concern over use of the Rectory Space</p> <p>Concern over sympathetic integration of plan with St Nicholas Church</p>	The Rectory Space has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			Q3	Well presented	This site(14) has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016
012 CR2 – transc ribed by CW	At St Nicholas	R	Q1a Q1b Q2 LNP21 /p44 LNDR20	No. More discussion re need for Sheltered Housing B or improving safety of roads/junctions Yes. Overall ideas are reasonable No recognition of current access from Pook Lane opposite the houses to Football field. Need new consideration (?) safety (?) of Pook Lane (very ????) MUST NOT block access from turning to Football field – only safe way of getting to village hall d.. Much too (???) NEED some PAVEMENT e.g. on Pook Lane very unsafe. Need to add some protected areas for pedestrians	Q1a – Sheltered Housing issue not identified through consultation process. Q2 - Consultation on Roads and Traffic Day July 2015 and other responses. LNDR21 –. Policy LNDR21 includes Bullet points 7,9 ,10 regarding access. Access across directly Pook Lane from houses opposite difficult due to road configuration and would compromise use of vegetation to restrict visibility of development. D -LNDR20 – Noted. Solution beyond scope of LNDR.
013	28/03/16 email	R	LNDR 20	I did manage to get to one of the meetings at St Nicholas' Church to see the plan, and did leave rather scribbled comments but lack of time meant that they may have been difficult to decipher. My comment was on the section re policy for traffic management. Whilst finding the presentation on the ideas behind the policy interesting I do not feel that they are born out in practice. I am particularly concerned about the traffic on Pook Lane approaching the A286 as this is where I live. This road already has no demarcation between pedestrians and traffic and no road markings but is very dangerous for pedestrians. Events at Goodwood make this even more unsafe. I recognise that there is a proposal for a footpath along the ancient monument but this does not address the issue after dark. I feel particularly if there are major building works on the football field it should be possible to widen Pook Lane enough to include a	Noted. The LNDR aims to balance safety needs with other policies i.e. Dark Sky Policy, a compromise would have to be found.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>pavement. All other roads in the village have some pavement area-including Sheepwash Lane which needs it less.</p> <p>I challenge the Parish Council to walk with small children, or some one elderly from the green to the bus stop on the A286 on a race day and not be terrified. When I have visitors of a nervous disposition they insist on taking a car the 50 metres from my house to the hall.</p>	Comment noted. New footbath provision within LNDP21 Bullet point no 10
014 CR3 – transc ribed by CW	At St Nicholas'	R	Communit y Matters 2.03 p4 2.05 p6 2.07 p7 p10 5.04 p18 5.05 p18	<p>Typos: Nature Trails “and signage”. Area Management plan/Encourage</p> <p>But important way <u>to</u> support WSHighways...should be WSCC Highways is likely to increase traffic congestion <u>if</u> impact Missing? Outside of the Parish) there..... Local <u>habits</u> Unfortunately there <u>are</u> other areas.</p>	Typos noted, amendments made
015	07/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b LNDP 26	<p>Yes Yes</p> <p>a-Site 14 – the Rectory. Whilst we have no objection to the principle of a small housing development, we have concerns about <u>both vehicular and pedestrian access to this site</u>. Access to our home is opposite the site and we know from experience how restricted are the lines of sight in both directions, particularly when cars are parked on the north side of Pook Lane for Church services or funerals. On the rectory side, the building which is an annex of Tuff's Mead is right on the road and there is no line of</p>	This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>sight coming out of the Rectory site. To the west, vehicles approaching the bridge over the River Lavant are obscured by the hump in the road and the parapets of the bridge.</p> <p>Traffic between the hours of 7am and 9am, and between 4pm and 7pm when the road is used as a "rat-run" is increasing all the time and these are dangerous times to try to join Pook Lane. The existing 30 mph limit is frequently ignored so it is unlikely that a 20 mph limit would work. We often see hand-held mobile phone use during the rush hours, which adds to the danger.</p> <p>Manor Farm, opposite, is a working farm with regular movements of large and often long vehicles. To gain access to the farm, long lorries have to use the full width of the road, along with the width of the pavement and grass verge, to turn into the gate, and if the carriageway were re-aligned to the north, as suggested in the plan, this would not be possible.</p> <p>The pavement to the north of Pook Lane is the only pedestrian access to the settlement area of East Lavant and is in regular use by residents, runners and walkers, and should not be diminished or lost.</p>	
016	07/04/16	R	Rectory "leaflet drop"	<p>Comments following leaflet drop re above.</p> <p>1 Is it within the South Downs National park? My reading of the map i saw showed the boundary on the north side of the road at the entrance of manor farm.</p> <p>2 This will only be dependant on the quality of the development and is a matter of opinion</p> <p>3 Agree and a new and safer access will be necessary</p> <p>4 Tough, who will miss them, who even knew they existed there? A</p>	This submission not applicable as it does not relate to the Pre-Submission document.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>red herring, not a great problem and would make any protest group look stupid if pursued.</p> <p>5 This is surely a matter to take up with the church authorities, such a loss will not be generally missed by many.</p> <p>Other points:- the Church seems to have acted in a rather underhand and less than transparent manner, they will have a PR problem on their hands.</p> <p>To condemn outright this development is wrong, what should happen is to firstly clarify the developer's plans, design, and site plan, access etc. Only when we know these answers would we be in a position to condemn outright, ask for a reduced size, approve or not the quality of the development in relationship to appearance, suitability, access and workmanship proposed.</p> <p>I would suggest oppose in principle as a holding position subject to more answers and clarity by the developer.</p> <p>My personal view s that the loss of the existing rectory would not be an architectural loss to the village - it is a site which could be sensitively developed and is more suitable for two quality houses rather than the current proposal which would fit in better in mid Lavant.</p> <p>yours</p>	
017	12/04/16	R		<p>Thank you for your letter of 14th March, I acknowledge its receipt. I would like to make a few comments on the Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan pre-submission draft document. I apologise for not using the official response form, but I had problems using it,</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LDNP15	<p>strength of our community to be cherished and protected as far as possible.</p> <p>I am also concerned <u>that 8 units are proposed</u> for this site. This seems to suggest overcrowding, particularly if car parking spaces are allowed for. If these are not sufficient then parking will be permanent along Pook Lane and this will add to the congestion when services are on at St Marys and events being held in the Memorial Hall. <u>The access in and out of that site is hazardous</u> due to lack of clear visibility on what is a 'rat run' during rush hour times: the likelihood of accidents is high and we really should give thought to the safety of prospective residents. I would ask the Parish Council to consider withdrawing this proposed development from the Plan.</p> <p>With reference to LDNP15 Core Floodplain Map Extract 3 The Environment and Sustainability. I own the short stretch of land beside the River Lavant and adjacent to Marsh Lane. Many residents will know that for years a Scout Hut was located on this site. I have been asked whether I would be prepared for a similar agreement in the future. I have observed this site carefully when the Lavant has been in flood and it is interesting to note that the water filtering down the meadow to the north of the site, mostly discharges through the gateway from the field on to Marsh Lane and the gully on the other side of the track. The site itself does not become flooded and there is no evidence of surface water making its way across the site and into the River Lavant. I would like to confirm therefore, with the necessary clearing of the scrub vegetation which has grown up over the subsequent years that this site could be considered for a community facility, such as a Scout Hut or a similar proposal. It does have the advantage of being geographically located almost centrally within the Lavant area. I would ask the</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			Para 3.08	<p>difficult to imagine that it will “conserve and where possible enhance the special characteristics of the National Park”, as required in LNDP2.</p> <p>3. The proposed development would dramatically alter the character of this part of East Lavant, and is therefore contrary to clause (c) of LNDP1. Accommodating 8 dwellings on this site will require a <u>density not found</u> elsewhere in East Lavant, and will therefore also be contrary to clause (a) of LNDP6. To fit 8 dwellings on this site, it will presumably be necessary to build at least some of them as flats. To my knowledge, there are no existing developments of this type in East Lavant. It is also noticeable that, unlike the proposed Church Farm Barns development (LNDP22), <u>there is no provision that the new structures should be no taller than the adjacent buildings, nor that the design and style of the development should reflect the East Lavant settlement.</u></p> <p>4. Access from the site onto Pook Lane is dangerous, with virtually no sightline to the east and limited visibility to the west. In the assessment of potential development sites, it suggests that this problem could be improved by re-alignment of the road or the imposition of a 20mph speed limit. In fact, re-alignment of the road is not possible without encroaching on to the vital footpath on the north of the road or onto private land, while a lower speed limit, even if it could be enforced, would arguably merely reduce the impact of any accident.</p> <p>5. The assessment of potential development sites states that “the change will not be highly visible as it will only be seen from the west, a field for grazing stock”. In fact, this prominent site is visible from a car driving east from the A286 along Pook Lane or south</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			Para 3.23	<p>along Sheepwash Lane, as well as from at least some of the village green and the Earl of March car park.</p> <p>6. Although this is not really a matter for the Parish Council, the fact that the proposed allocation has been approved by the diocese without specific provision being made for another site for the Rectory has led some people to speculate that the intention will be at some stage to combine Lavant with another parish.</p> <p>I also have two minor factual corrections to suggest to the pre-submission document. In paragraph <u>3.08, Lavant House School is described</u> as a girls' boarding school. It is in fact an independent girls' day and boarding school. <u>In paragraph 3.23, it should be made clear that the bus services only operate through Mid Lavant.</u> Please feel free to contact me if you have any queries on the above points.</p>	
019	13/04/16	Chichester City Council		The Chichester City Council have resolved to support the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan. David Few - City Council Planning Adviser	Comment noted
020	13/14/16	R	LNDP26	I was somewhat surprised to learn at the recent public consultation days at St Nicholas' Church that the rectory in Pook lane is now one of the sites for new building, especially as I am a member of the LNP! Albeit to say I was away for many months in the winter but I have been on the committee for must be 2 1/2yrs and took part in the walk around the whole area last year. The site on the Goodwood sheds on Fordwater Road for, I believe, 5 houses, was on that build proposal but nothing about building on the vicarage area. I agree that the Goodwood shed area would be an excellent improvement on the lines of the Manor Farm renovated buildings so do we REALLY need to carve up a garden virtually next door for another 8 houses! The LNP had spent years working on possible	This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>building sites and the local community have been involved throughout with feedback taken on board and incorporated where thought necessary. The village input has been remarkable as has all the hard work of the LNP Steering Committee. There are more than enough very sensible and obvious building sites, acceptable in-fills, which are possible within the village community without having to ?demolish, carve up and ruin a perfectly adequate house and garden!</p> <p>At the moment we have no vicar but that is now only for the short term. Obviously the vicar needs to live near the church so the present rectory is ideal. Where and when would a new rectory be built and how long would that take? Not very encouraging for our new vicar. I believe there is a pond in the garden with a colony of great crested newts so presumably the pond will remain with new build around it. Already Pook Lane is a death trap with fast rat run traffic, more cars accessing the road will create even more danger for pedestrians including children and dogs.</p> <p>Whilst writing I would like to point out how lethal Fordwater Road is. The big 4x4's now on the market leave VERY little room for passing cars and as for trying to walk with my dog to the footpath just beyond those Goodwood sheds..... one would be manic to try.</p> <p>On another matter entirely and for improving the village green for young children around East Lavant, I would like to suggest a play area in one corner. This would prove a very popular addition the the village hall area.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Your sincerely, Helen Spiegelberg The Old Granary, East Lavant</p>	<p>Points noted and shared by other responses. All planning applications have to go through and be supported by WSCC Highways department. As such any proposed development of this site will have to address these concerns, at the planning application stage. NAR</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
021	15/04/16	Shona Turner CDC	Comm. Well-being 2.04	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon Lavant's Neighbourhood Development Plan, my comments are as follows:</p> <p>From the beginning this Plan comes across as being clear, concise, well thought through and gives an overall summary of what exists within the area, along with the potential to safe guard the existing facilities etc.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. My main comment, however, is that it does not go into any great depth which is a shame and it would be hoped that, when working through their 'Community Matters', they would come up with a more defined action plan. b. My other points are that they refer to Lavant Memorial Hall throughout the document; however, the name of the hall is not consistent and in some places gives the impression that there is more than one village hall in the Parish. c. I do not think they have fully considered the impact the new housing will have upon their existing facilities, although they do mention that the Memorial Hall does require improvement (Community Wellbeing Projects 2.04). Bearing this in mind, although they do have some projects identified within CDC's Infrastructure Business Plan, there does not appear to be any correlation between the projects listed in the IBP and the ones in their NHP and the 'Community Matters' document which again, is a shame, especially as they refer to possible S106 and CIL funding for their 'Community Matters' projects. d. On the other hand, it is good to read their aspirations for St Nicholas' Church to become more of a community hub, as said, it would also be beneficial to have this project in the IBP. e. I would also add that, with regards to the (Community Matters, 3.0 Assets of Community Value), it may be useful for them to have a meeting with David Hyland to discuss this in greater detail. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Action Plan is desirable but not part of the LNDR process. b. Comment noted. c/d/e. Comment noted.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Shona Turner – CDC contd)	Comm. Matters 3.0 p11 3.04	<p>f. (Incidentally, there might be typo in this section; page 11, paragraphs 3.04 'community faculties' should perhaps be 'community facilities'.</p> <p>I am not sure if David has any further comments to make upon this but he is not back from annual leave until next week.</p> <p>Of course, if you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to ask.</p>	f. Comment noted.
022	15/04/16	Southern Water (Southern Water contd)		<p>We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Submission Lavant Neighbourhood Plan. Southern Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for Lavant, with a duty to serve new development, and as such is committed to ensuring the right infrastructure in the right place at the right time in collaboration with developers and the Local Planning Authority. The 'made' Lavant Neighbourhood Plan, together with the adopted South Downs National Park and Chichester Local Plans will inform Southern Water's investment planning. Adoption provides the planning certainty required to support investment proposals to Ofwat, the water industry's economic regulator. Investment proposals are prepared every five years through the price review process. The last price review was in 2014. Ofwat's price determination funds the investment programme for the period to 2020. There will be another price review in 2019, covering the investment period 2020 to 2025.</p> <p>Strategic infrastructure such as extensions to wastewater treatment works can be planned and funded through the price review process, and coordinated with new development.</p> <p>However, Ofwat takes the view that local infrastructure, such as local sewers, should be delivered by the development if this is</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 11	<p>specifically required to service individual development sites. To this end, the principle is that new development needs to connect to the sewerage systems at the nearest points of adequate capacity. This may require off-site infrastructure if the nearest point is not located within the immediate vicinity of the site.</p> <p>We look to Lavant's Parish Council, the South Downs National Park and Chichester District Councils to ensure through planning policies and conditions that development is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and not permitted to proceed unless it connects to the sewerage system at the nearest points of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider. This will ensure that levels of service are maintained to both new and existing customers, and that the risk of flooding is not increased to unacceptable levels.</p> <p>Please find following our response in respect of specific policies. We hope that you will find this useful and that it will be taken into account in the next version of your Neighbourhood Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of future progress.</p> <p>Local Community Space</p> <p>Southern Water understands Lavant Parish Council's desire to protect community space. However, we cannot support the current wording of this policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, from delivering their essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development. Southern Water may have to provide additional wastewater infrastructure to serve new and existing customers or meet stricter environmental standards. It is likely that there would be limited options with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Southern Water contd)	LNDP 15	<p>important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'.</p> <p>a- Proposed amendment Accordingly, we propose the following additional wording to policy LNDP11 (new wording <u>underlined</u>): Proposals affecting Local Community Spaces [...] will only be supported if the proposed development improves the existing use and community value of the space, <u>or it is essential to meet specific utility infrastructure needs, where it has been demonstrated that no suitable alternative location is available.</u></p> <p>b- Core Floodplain and Flood Risk</p> <p>Southern Water understands Lavant Parish Council's desire to restrict development in the floodplain. However, we cannot support the current wording of this policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, from delivering their essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development. Southern Water may have to provide additional wastewater infrastructure to serve new and existing customers or meet stricter environmental standards. It is likely that there would be limited options with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and Wastewater infrastructure sometimes has locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'. Therefore, utility infrastructure is considered to</p>	<p>a. Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Areas designated as Local Community Space are not considered appropriate for large scale utility development, however an exception will be added to facilitate essential small scale utility infrastructure.</p> <p>b. Noted. The policy wording will be updated to specify the types of development that may be appropriate in the floodplain.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Southern Water contd)		<p>constitute the 'very special circumstances' envisaged by paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Whilst paragraph 7.14 of the LNDP acknowledges NPPF guidance that makes exception for essential infrastructure development within the functional floodplain, it is felt that this should be reflected in policy rather than supporting text.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>c- Accordingly, we propose the following additional wording to policy LNDP15 (new wording <u>underlined</u>):</p> <p>[...] Development in the core floodplain will not be supported, <u>unless it is for the provision of essential utility infrastructure, where it has been demonstrated that no suitable alternative location is available.</u></p> <p>d- Additional policy on the provision of water and wastewater infrastructure</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of Objective LOB11 that infrastructure improvements will be encouraged and supported. However, the objective is aimed more specifically at transport infrastructure than utility infrastructure. For example, it may be the case that additional wastewater treatment capacity at Lavant Wastewater Treatment Works might be required over the life time of the Neighbourhood Plan in order to serve new development, or to meet stricter environmental standards. We could find no policies to support the development of such infrastructure. One of the core planning</p>	<p>Noted. The policy wording will be updated to specify the types of development that may be appropriate in the floodplain.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(southern water contd)	LDNP 21 Section 8	<p>principles contained in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'. Also, National Planning Practice Guidance states that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'. Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to waste development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system. On this basis, we propose the following policy provision, which could be included at the end of Section 8: Transport and Infrastructure:</p> <p><u>LDNP21 - Wastewater Infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>8.20 New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</u></p> <p>e- Eastmead Industrial Estate</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies that the above site could provide around 30 residential units. In line with paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance, we have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this proposal. Our assessment reveals that the local sewerage system currently has limited capacity to accommodate additional development at this scale. This is not a constraint to development however, provided planning policy for this site ensures that proposed development</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LDNP 23	<p>makes a connection to the sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p> <p>If development is permitted to proceed without such policy provision where there is inadequate capacity in the sewerage network, Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connection and the system could become overloaded, leading to pollution of the environment. This situation would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, there could be a risk that the necessary local sewerage infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the proposed development, unless delivery is supported by planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. This is supported by the core planning principles identified in the NPPF, notably to: 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs' and ensure that plans 'provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency'. Our approach is also supported by paragraph 21 of the NPPF, which requires that planning policies should recognise and seek to address any lack of infrastructure. The National Planning Practice Guidance specifies that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'.</p> <p>We also take this opportunity to point out that Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the proposed site at Eastmead Industrial Estate, which needs to be taken into account when designing any proposed development. An easement width of 6 metres would be required, which may affect the site layout or require diversion. This</p>	<p>This does not relate solely to LDNP21(Football Field) and this statement should be included as a (new) para 8.20 as suggested:</p> <p><i>Add new para 8.20 pg 42 'New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.'</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(southern water contd)		<p>easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance, we propose the following additional bullet points at the end of policy LNDP23 :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development will need to provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by the service provider. • Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. <p>f- Summersdale Garage & Maddoxwood House</p> <p>Southern Water welcomes the consideration of its wastewater infrastructure within local and neighbourhood plan policies, however the wording in Policy LNDP24 places the onus on the developer to provide an assessment of the capacity of Southern Water's infrastructure.</p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that such assessments should be made by 'authorities and providers', and in accordance with this, we have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the existing capacity of our infrastructure and its ability to meet the forecast demand for this proposal. Our assessment reveals that the local sewerage system has limited capacity to accommodate the proposed development.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 24	<p>This is not a constraint to development however, providing there is planning policy support for the provision of the necessary local infrastructure, and that development is required to make a connection to the sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p> <p>If development is permitted to proceed without such policy provision where there is inadequate capacity in the sewerage network, Southern Water has limited powers to prevent connection and the system could become overloaded, leading to pollution of the environment. This situation would be contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF, which requires the planning system to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, there could be a risk that the necessary local sewerage infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the proposed development, unless delivery is supported by planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. This is supported by the core planning principles identified in the NPPF, notably to: 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs' and ensure that plans 'provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency' . Our approach is also supported by paragraph 21 of the NPPF, which requires that planning policies should recognise and seek to address any lack of infrastructure. The National Planning Practice Guidance specifies that 'Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development'.</p> <p>Proposed amendment:</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. Amendment will be made to add an Issue under LNDP23: <i>A connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network will need to be made, as advised by the service provider. (As for LNDP24).</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 24 contd	<p>To ensure consistency with the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance, we propose the following amendments to Policy LNDP24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any application should be accompanied by a Sewerage Infrastructure Assessment confirming that the local sewerage infrastructure can accommodate the proposed development, or; • <u>A connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network will be made, as advised by the service provider.</u> 	Noted and agreed. Amendment will be made to add an Issue under LNDP23: <i>A connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network will need to be made, as advised by the service provider. (As for LNDP24).</i>
023	14/04/16	Holly Nicol CDC Rural Housing	Page 15 Para 3.17 Page 25 LDNP 7	<p>a- It is advised the breakdown of social rented units is removed (i.e. 5% are council owned and 20% housing association owned), as CDC has not held any housing stock since 2001 when they transferred their stock to Hyde Martlet. It is assumed the 5% completed the census form incorrectly.</p> <p>b- New Dwelling Size and Tenure</p> <p>The proposal to require an affordable housing contribution on developments of 3 or more units is not inline with the current or emerging SDNP policies for the SDNP area, and affordable housing policies in</p>	<p>a. Comment noted. Amendment made</p> <p>SG in discussion with ..SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY have noted and reviewed comment.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>the CDC Local Plan for the CDC area of the parish.</p> <p>Currently, the CDC Interim Statement for Planning for Affordable Housing Requires 20% to be delivered on site on schemes of 5-9 dwellings, and 40% on schemes with 10 or more dwellings within the SDNP area, with any fraction to be paid as a commuted sum, calculated inline with The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development In Chichester District SPG.</p> <p>The emerging SDNP policy will seek a 40% requirement on any development (1+ units). Policy 34 of the CDC Local plan requires 30% to be delivered as an affordable housing contribution on sites of 6-10 dwellings, calculated inline with the Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD, and provide a 30% on site contribution on schemes of 11+ dwellings and any fraction to be paid as a commuted sum.</p> <p>It is advised the 50% affordable housing contribution in Policy LNDP7 is amended to reflect the requirements above, i.e. having two separate policies; one for inside the park and one for outside the park, and ensuring the affordable housing contributions are inline with the above unless robust viability evidence can be provided to justify a diversion from policy.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the proposed dwelling sizes are to be imposed on all units. It is advised that this is removed, as this is very restrictive, especially taking into consideration the plan is over a 15 year period and needs and national policies are continually changing.</p> <p>“Commuted sums in lieu of affordable housing provision are not acceptable within the Parish” – It is advised this comment is removed, as mentioned above if a contribution includes a fraction</p>	<p>Noted/NAR</p> <p>LNDP7: Even though 50% is evidenced through Lavant Housing Needs Survey / CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL Review Evidence Base Documents and is a central principle of LNDP is providing Housing in line with LAVANT'S NEEDS. Policy wording is amended to remove specific %. And comply with the relevant Planning Authority.</p> <p>Comments regarding commuted sums are noted. The plan must seek to ensure that sustainable housing is provided in the correct places and by ensuring that</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>on a commuted sum will be sought.</p> <p>If you wish to discuss further please contact me, kind regards Holly Nicol Rural Housing Enabler, CDC</p>	<p>commuted sums are not utilised will ensure that affordable Housing is provided within this parish. This is a fundamental principle of LNDP. Wording of LNDP7 amended to <i>“Commuted sums in lieu of affordable housing provision are only acceptable within the Parish when the contribution relates to less than a whole dwelling”</i></p>
024	28/04/16	Robert Lloyd Sweet – Historic England		<p>To whom it may concern: Re: Lavant Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission version consultation</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the pre-submission version of the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England’s remit is to provide advice on planning for the historic environment, including promoting the conservation and enjoyment of heritage assets and principles of good design in historic places. As such, we have restricted our comments to those areas of the plan where we can predict an impact on the historic environment or can see opportunities to achieve these ends. With regard to Neighbourhood Planning a specific role is to ensure that plan-making has included appropriate consideration of impacts on designated heritage assets and the need to conserve them in a way appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>We have a number of suggested amendments to ensure the wording of policies achieve the desired outcome in decision making and a number of more substantive concerns relating to the proposed land use allocations.</p> <p>Firstly we would like to congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan group on the really positive work undertaken on preparing a list of locally significant non-designated heritage assets as part of the</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Historic England contd)		neighbourhood plan. The process used, including defining an appropriate set of criteria and going through a clear assessment and consultation process (the present consultation) is an example of good practice that we will share with other neighbourhood planning groups seeking to achieve the same measures.	
			Policy LNDP 4	We will refer to the individual sites through the separate allocation policies below but on the whole, given potential impacts on both designated and non- designated heritage assets we feel that the numbers allocated to each site may require some revision.	Comments noted. LNDP4 will be updated if necessary following review.
			Policy LDNP 5	-Rather than suggesting that materials are used to complement the existing palette used in Lavant, it would provide greater certainty if the key materials already present and considered characteristic, are clearly identified either within the policy or through reference in the policy to supporting documentation. These could be set out in a character statement or conservation area appraisal (as appropriate), to which the policy would refer applicants and decision makers. This may be included as part of the evidence base to the plan or prepared subsequent to its adoption in collaboration with the District Council/National Park Authority. Without this type of robust approach, materials that are already present but considered un-characteristic may be cited as precedent to justify design that has not achieved the quality desired for new development. <u>Finally, the last clause of the policy is superfluous as it is the role of the local planning authority to determine whether the development is acceptable.</u> The material supporting the application should provide	It is considered appropriate as general guidance to refer specifically to the characteristic materials of Lavant and therefore agreed to amend the 4 th bullet in the Policy to read: <i>“Use building and landscaping materials externally that are characteristic of Lavant (primarily brick/flint work walls, timber cladding, timber windows, clay tiled roofs and lead flashings) and are of a quality and life expectancy that match or complement the existing palette.”</i> Controls within the Conservation Area and listed properties and their curtilage are already set by the LPA

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Historic England contd)	<p>Policy LDNP 6</p> <p>Policy LDNP 14</p>	<p>information that will inform their decision-making including demonstrating how the design has responded to the policy needs.</p> <p>We recommend changing “historic” in the final bullet point to “heritage” to clearly align the policy with existing national and local planning policies.</p> <p>We support the protection of landscape character and identification of key views within the plan and would suggest a minor amendment to the policy to clarify how impacts on views will be judged. We also felt that the policy could be given greater strength by splitting the second paragraph into two parts:</p> <p>“Development will be supported where it maintains the local landscape character and does not cause unacceptable loss or diminution of visibility or positive character of the landscape within Key Views, as identified on the Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Map.</p> <p>Developments proposals that will have a harmful impact could affect landscape character, lie within the identified Key Views or that could affect public access to and enjoyment of them must be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment setting out the expected impact on the view. The application should also make clear how the need to protect the character of the landscape and key views have influenced the proposed design of development. demonstrating that the impact of the proposed development will be acceptable.</p>	<p>The last bullet is considered appropriate to encourage a properly integrated design that is all too often not a priority of the LPA in its detail.</p> <p>Amend the last bullet to read: <i>“Incorporate and integrate”</i></p> <p>Agreed – replace <i>historic</i> with <i>heritage</i></p> <p>LNDP14 AGREED to change wording to reflect HE suggestions and suggestions from South Downs National Park Authority (029)</p> <p><i>“Where development has a harmful impact on landscape character or open views, the development will not be permitted unless the proposal can demonstrate mitigation can be achieved on land within the applicant’s control and will reduce any harm to an acceptable level. ‘Applications should be supported by a landscape assessment in accordance with the ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013’. Such an assessment should be proportionate to the proposed scale of development and the degree and extent of any likely impacts on the landscape”.</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			Policy LNDP 17	<p>The sentence at 7.08 appears to be incomplete. Key View 2. The second sentence appears to be incomplete.</p> <p>In general we would recommend amending the description of these views to read as “View of from ...” rather than “towards “ as this makes it clearer what features in the view are considered to be desirable to sustain.</p> <p>We are pleased to support the use of Policy LNDP17 to identify and protect non-designated heritage assets that have a special local significance. The designation criteria are used to choose heritage assets and to understand their ‘significance’ but are not the significance that should be conserved. We recommend replacing the words ‘designation criteria’ in the policy and supporting text with ‘significance’, which is the term used and defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Comments noted and changes made.</p> <p>Amend second para of policy to read: <i>“All proposals that have the potential to directly impact, or impact on the setting of the following must provide a heritage statement demonstrating that the impacts do not detract from the assets’ significance: ...”</i></p> <p>Wording amended to 7:22</p> <p>1.01 This policy offers protection to a number of identified local heritage assets (including key buildings, roads and other historic sites) that are central to the history of the village.. Any development that impacts these assets will be expected to demonstrate how those impacts do not detract from the designation criteria. These criteria are:</p> <p>1.02 The place is demonstrably special to a local community.</p> <p>1.03 It holds a particular historic significance.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Historic England contd)	Policy LNDP 21	<p>We are concerned that the allocation of the site at Pook Lane for delivery of 12 residential units has not been prepared with a suitably robust assessment of the significance of the scheduled monument, including the contribution of its setting to its significance. It is our view that the present visibility of the monument in an open landscape setting is an important element of its significance. The views of the monument across a large open area provide evidence of and illustrates its historical role as a highly visible boundary feature in the landscape, enclosing a large and generally open area and seen across a similarly <u>open landscape</u>, whilst the present openness and access to the site allows considerable freedom for the public to experience and appreciate this significance. We feel that the development that would be promoted by the policy would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the significance of the monument. Whilst we can see that some development within the site could be acceptable in order to secure funding for the clearance and improved future management of the monument as well as other public benefits including provision of affordable housing, we feel this could be achieved by developing a smaller part of the site and thus avoiding or minimising harm to the heritage asset. We do not feel that providing the buffer alongside the monument as shown in the drawing on page 44</p>	<p>1.04 Longevity of the asset is in the interest of the community</p> <p>1.05 It is irreplaceable in its historic nature OR the building /feature is significant in maintaining and /or enhancing the setting of key aspects of the village</p> <p><i>Add to 7:20 Refer to Maps included in <u>Review of Heritage Assets Evidence Base</u>.</i></p> <p><u>open landscape</u> The open landscape setting at present is only discerned from the south (courtesy of the local owner) It is screened from the south via grade separation of Pook Lane and from the west by vegetation.</p> <p>The low (circa 12 dwellings) recognises that there remains a substantial part of the site that is undeveloped and therefore can provide an appropriate setting for the Dyke.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(Historic England contd)	<p data-bbox="562 485 674 544">Policy LNDP 22</p> <p data-bbox="562 1203 674 1262">Policy LNDP 24</p>	<p data-bbox="680 268 1447 405">provides a sufficiently open setting to achieve the objective of protecting the contribution of the monument's setting to its significance. As such, in its present form we would object to this policy.</p> <p data-bbox="680 448 1496 762">H-We are pleased to see the consideration of the historic farm buildings at Church Farm Barns, which, in combination with the local listing of these features provides a positive strategy for the conservation of these buildings. <u>We would suggest adding to the first sentence of the preliminary text at 9.08 "The site is on the southern perimeter of East Lavant, within the Conservation Area and containing several ranges of farm buildings that contribute positively to the historic and architectural interest of the conservation area and to its historic rural character."</u></p> <p data-bbox="680 842 1482 1161">Furthermore we would suggest that a development would be most appropriately designed to fit the context of the farmstead within the conservation area rather than to the settlement of East Lavant as a whole and therefore would suggest replacing the fifth bullet point with: " The design and style of the development should reflect the character of the historic farmstead as part of the East Lavant conservation area East Lavant settlement".</p> <p data-bbox="680 1203 1491 1410">I-The predicted course of a Roman road runs through the site and is indeed shown on the map on page 49. This should be identified as a potential heritage asset that could affect delivery of the site. In order to ensure development proposals are prepared with a suitable understanding of the potential presence of archaeological remains and, where necessary to either ensure they are preserved</p>	<p data-bbox="1512 448 2152 512">Further site specific discussions are ongoing there is a need to balance all views expressed in the responses.</p> <p data-bbox="1512 842 2152 1050"><i>Agreed add wording The site is on the southern perimeter of East Lavant, within the Conservation Area and comprises various types of farm buildings. These contribute positively to the historic and architectural interest of the Conservation Area and to its historic rural character.</i></p> <p data-bbox="1512 1098 2163 1342">Farmstead is not a dwelling. It should be designed as a cluster of buildings. Concern covered by other policies , however Change 5th bullet point in Policy BOX " The design and style of the development should reflect the character of the historic farmstead as part of the East Lavant conservation area East Lavant settlement".</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>in-situ or appropriately recorded prior to development we recommend the following text is added to the policy:</p> <p>“Development proposals should be informed by a programme of archaeological investigation undertaken according to a written scheme of investigation agreed in writing with the Council’s archaeological advisor.</p> <p>Where archaeological remains are identified as present within the site priority will be given to the preservation of archaeological remains of national importance in-situ. Where it is agreed that the public benefits of the proposal justify the loss of archaeological remains further archaeological recording and publication may be required prior to or during development.”</p>	<p>Comments Noted – Plan has been updated to reflect the concerns raised.</p>
			Policy LDNP 25	<p>Retaining all trees on the site may be unrealistic if some are dead, dying or dangerous, whilst it is predicable that some trees will naturally reach the end of the life span during the plan period. To sustain the character of the conservation area we recommend inserting the following to the Policy “or replaced when necessary with specimens that sustain the contribution of the churchyard to the setting of the church and as an historic space within the conservation area”.</p>	<p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p>
			Policy LDNP 26	<p>The site lies within the East Lavant Conservation and contains a feature identified as a potential heritage asset. As such a development should be Informed by appropriate information to guide decision making as required by the NPPF. We recommend inserting the following in the policy:</p> <p>“Development proposals affecting the site will be supported by a heritage assessment including consideration of the site’s contribution to the East Lavant Conservation Area, the significance</p>	<p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>of the identified 'curio' and the contribution of the site to the significance of any nearby heritage assets. A design and access statement will be required to show how the design of the development proposal has responded to the need to sustain or enhance the significance of these heritage assets."</p> <p>We hope these comments are of assistance in taking the Neighbourhood Plan forward. Nevertheless we will be pleased to discuss any queries you may have relating to our comments or to provide further information that can assist you.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	
025	26/04/16	Environment Agency		<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on your Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan. We are a statutory consultee in the planning process providing advice to Local Authorities and developers on pre-application enquiries, planning applications, appeals and strategic plans.</p> <p>Together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at:</p> <p>http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</p> <p>Please also find attached a copy of a Neighbourhood Plan checklist we have recently developed to help provide Environment Agency advice at the earlier stages of Neighbourhood Plan preparation.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. We have had to focus our detailed engagement to those areas where the environmental risks are greatest.</p> <p>Our detailed comments are as follows:</p>	
			LNDP 21	<p>a- parts of the allocated site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. We are pleased to see however that the proposed location for housing has been directed to the area at the lowest probability of flooding and that the housing is located within Flood Zone 1.</p>	<p><u>LNDP21</u> This is an incorrect assessment by the EA as the Site is well above any Flood Zone.</p>
			LNDP 22	<p>b- as pointed out in the plan, some of this site is within Flood Zone 2. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 100-102, we recommend the Sequential Test is undertaken when allocating sites to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. The Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). We would have concerns if development is allocated in this flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.</p>	<p>LNDP22 This site is considered sufficiently far (cf with the Farm House adjacent) from the river to enable flood mitigation measures to be incorporated.</p> <p>This request is not relevant to these site Specific policies. NAR</p>
			LNDP 23	<p>as detailed in the document, the NE corner of the site is within Flood Zone 2. Again we recommend that the sequential test is undertaken. In addition, due to past and present uses of Eastmead Industrial Estate, there may be contamination on-site and the risks of contamination may need to be investigated. This is especially important as the site is located in a sensitive groundwater area (Source Protection Zone 2).</p>	<p>Not applicable see comment Site 22. NAR</p> <p>NAR. Within the policy</p>
			LNDP 24	<p>c- this site is adjacent to a historic landfill site. The Environmental Health Department of the local council</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			<p>LNDP 26</p> <p>Wastewater</p>	<p>should be contacted for further advice. In addition, due to past and present uses of the allocated site, there may be contamination on-site and the risks of contamination may need to be investigated.</p> <p>d- as detailed in the plan, the site is in Flood Zone 2 and a sequential test should be undertaken.</p> <p>e- Wastewater treatment for all sites – Southern Water should be contacted to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to receive foul drainage to the mains sewerage system.</p> <p>Should you have any queries or wish to discuss the response in more detail, then please do not hesitate to contact us. Best Wishes, Environment Agency, Solent and South Downs Area (email attach. Neighbourhood Plan checklist)</p>	<p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
026	28/04/16	David Bowie Highways England		<p>Lavant Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-submission Draft Document</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Highways England with regard to Lavant Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-submission Draft Document.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network.</p> <p>I note that the foreword to the Neighbourhood Development Plan contains a notice with regard to the Parish Council's concerns around the potential for an A27 Northern Bypass around Chichester and indeed the document lists this as a potential threat in the 'SWOT' analysis of the parish at page 10. Hopefully you will now be aware that Highways England does not have plans to proceed with a Northern Chichester Bypass.</p> <p>It may be useful to explain briefly the process Highways England must go through when considering substantial improvements to the strategic road network. We have a duty to ensure that the options put forward for consultation are based on accurate and up-to-date evidence and data. Our starting point for improving the A27 near Chichester were the longstanding proposals for a series of junction upgrades along the existing route of A27. As the previous feasibility studies were carried out several years ago and may no longer be accurate, it was incumbent on us to explore all potential options to ensure that the taxpayer gets the best solution for their investment. Once all options were examined against the criteria of the Government's Road Investment Strategy and the budget available, the northern routes were discounted and will not be part of the public consultation. The forthcoming public consultation will present each of the options we are shortlisting and an assessment of the pros and cons of each. We genuinely want to hear what</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>people think, and the consultation will help shape the final proposed upgrade.</p> <p>I hope that the above assures the Parish Council that it is not our intention to promote a northern bypass and that the notice in the foreword to the plan and the Threat listed in the SWOT analysis on page 10 can be removed from the document.</p> <p>We have no further comments on your plan and welcome further consultation as this progresses.</p> <p>Best regards Sent on behalf of Elizabeth Cleaver Highways England David</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
027	28/04/16	Lucy Seymour-Bowdery WSCC		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Parish Council's Consultation Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Lavant.</p> <p>General In general, the County Council looks for Neighbourhood Plans to be in conformity with the District and Borough Councils' latest draft or adopted development plans. The County Council supports the District and Borough Councils in preparing the evidence base for these plans and aligns its own infrastructure plans with them. The County Council encourages Parish Councils to make use of this information which includes transport studies examining the impacts of proposed development allocations. Where available this information will be published on its website or that of the relevant Local Planning Authority. In relation to its own statutory functions, the County Council expects all Neighbourhood Plans to take due account of its policy documents and their supporting Sustainability</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 4	<p>Appraisals. These documents include the West Sussex Waste Local Plan, Minerals Local Plan and West Sussex Transport Plan. It is also recommended that published County Council service plans, for example Planning School Places and West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan, are also taken into account.</p> <p>Minerals Lavant is underlain by sharp sand and gravel, a mineral that is being included within our Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) and Mineral Consultation Areas (MCA) in the emerging West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan. Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that minerals should not be needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development and that policies should encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practicable and environmentally feasible. Once adopted, district and borough councils will need to consult the County Council for any planning applications that fall within the MCA, and where necessary, developers will be required to provide evidence of whether or not prior extraction is practicable and environmentally feasible at any site being considered for development.</p> <p>Policies This policy makes provision for at least 75 new dwellings in the Plan period. It should be noted that this is a higher level of development for the parish than is proposed in the South Downs Local Plan: Preferred Options. Given that this level of development in Lavant will not be tested as part of the transport evidence base to support the South Downs Local Plan, consideration should be given to the cumulative impact of the proposed sites on the local highway network. Based on an initial desktop assessment of the sites and consideration of local highway issues, it is requested that the County Council is provided with evidence to demonstrate the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is considered that the needs for cumulative impact assessments is outside the scope of the LNDP and will be addressed through the planning application process.</p> <p>Noted that CIL should mitigate impact on schools.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>cumulative impact of the proposed sites on the A286 / Pook Lane junction. An estimated aggregated peak hour trip generation from all sites will need to be provided. It will then need to be estimated what proportion of these trips will be travelling through this junction. <u>The County Council can assist with the methodology for this assessment.</u></p> <p>Primary schools in the local area will require expansion by up to half a form of entry (1/2 FE) to ensure requirements from the proposed housing development are met. <u>The County Council will work with the South Downs National Park Authority to seek Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions to mitigate the cost of expansion of existing primary schools. This will also involve cross-border working with Chichester District Council.</u></p>	
			LDNP 15	<p>This policy states 'All development proposals on previously developed land (i.e. brownfield) must demonstrate that surface water run-off from the application site as a result of the development will be equivalent to that if it were greenfield.' It should be noted that Defra guidance <i>Sustainable Drainage Systems: Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems</i> (March, 2015) states that the run-off for sites which have been previously developed 'must be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield runoff rate from the development for the same rainfall event, but should never exceed the rate of discharge from the development prior to redevelopment for that event'. This is the case for both peak flow control and volume control.</p>	Comments noted. Policy wording will be updated as appropriate.
			LDNP 19	<p>This policy aims to set minimum car parking standards for new residential development. Whilst it is agreed that parking should not add pressure to the highway network, in some cases this policy</p>	<p><u>Suggested that the policy is less prescriptive to ensure that there is more flexibility over how the spaces .</u> Decisions</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 20	<p>could lead to an oversupply particularly with parking provision for flats. It is <u>suggested that the policy is less prescriptive</u> to ensure that there is more flexibility over how the spaces are provided. Please refer to the County Council's Guidance on Car Parking in Residential Developments and the Car Parking Demand Calculator, which can be accessed via the following link: https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/information-for-developers/pre-application-advice-for-roads-and-transport/</p> <p>This policy sets out proposed traffic management measures for new and existing roads. For the third bullet point, it should be stated that there will be some exceptions i.e. if a road was already narrow, it would not be appropriate to further reduce its actual width. Any traffic management measures should be in accordance with requisite design guidance such as <i>Manual For Streets</i> or <i>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges</i>.</p> <p>Small scale housing allocations Given that the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan for Lavant includes the proposed allocation of small scale housing sites, it should be noted that site specific principles in the Neighbourhood Plan will need to be tested and refined through the Development Management process (through the provision of pre-application advice or at the planning application stage) or as part of a consultation for a Community Right to Build Order. Whilst the</p>	<p>- that we should maintain numbers but allow for more flexibility in location of those numbers. Ref Pg41 para 8:13 -Policy should include garages as 'allocated parking spaces'. Amend. first sentence in Policy Box to read ' .. <i>off road parking spaces including garages as set out ...</i> Amend (a) in Policy Box to omit words' .. <i>if it is a flat...</i>' National and Local Guidance also includes provision for cycle spaces. No need to include here.pg40 8:10</p> <p>The policy recognises the 'parking demand calculator' but also makes the point that the baseline data (2001 census) could be out of date.</p> <p>Detailed design stage NAR LNDP supports innovative road traffic management ideas not the status quo</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>County Council supports the proactive approach undertaken to allocate sites in the Local Plan, we are unable to comment on site specific principles at this stage other than the considerations set out below (policies LNDP23, LNDP24 & LNDP25). In considering site specific principles, please refer to the attached Development Management guidance.</p> <p>The County Council currently operates a scheme of charging for highways and transport pre-application advice to enable this service to be provided to a consistent and high standard. Please find further information on our charging procedure through the following link: http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/roads_and_pathways/plans_and_projects/development_control_for_roads/pre-application_charging_guide.aspx</p>	
			LNDP 23	<p>It is unclear as to the level of light industrial and office use that is proposed and to what extent it is additional to existing permitted use. Please provide further information on the existing use including floorspace and type of use. This will then need to be compared with the proposed use and should inform the cumulative assessment highlighted above for Policy LNDP4.</p>	<p>Ongoing site discussions Request not relevant to LNDPSG. Is a planning issue.</p>
			LDNP 24	<p>For the third bullet point, it would need to be demonstrated that a new route is deliverable. It is suggested that this section is amended to 'enhance cycle and pedestrian access to Centurion Way'.</p>	<p>Amend 2nd bullet point to read .. <i>should be central to the development ...</i>'</p> <p>NAR .The policy should remain for the developer to connect the development to Centurion Way because "enhance" means that there is already a link and there is not!</p>
			LNDP 24	<p>Please note, any speed limit change would be subject to approval. It is suggested that the fourth bullet point refers to 'support' for a speed limit change.</p>	<p>Amend the 4th bullet typo...<i>the Developer to support an application to extend the 30mph speed limit...to the north of Summersdale garage site .</i></p>
				<p>For the second bullet point, if the existing access is to be retained, it will need to be demonstrated that it is suitable to accommodate any</p>	<p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 25	<p>intensification in use. It is suggested that this section is amended to 'retain the location of the access and improve, if necessary, the existing access arrangements'.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Lucy (email attached doc: Development Management Guidance)</p>	
028	27/04/16	<p>Valerie Dobson CDC</p> <p>(cdc contd)</p>	LNDP 1	<p>Pre Submission Lavant Neighbourhood Development 2016-2031 (Regulation 14)</p> <p>Chichester District Council – Planning Policy Response – April 2016</p> <p>As the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) is the lead Authority on this Neighbourhood Plan, Chichester District Council Planning Policy comments are generally confined to the area outside the South Downs National Park. However, various other Council departments have provided separate comments on the Plan directly to the Parish.</p> <p>It is evident that a considerable amount of work has been undertaken in relation to the presubmission Lavant Neighbourhood Plan (NDP). However, as drafted, in terms of its overall approach to housing provision, the NDP does not appear to clearly set out that the starting point for the delivery of any housing is its location in a National Park. It would be helpful if this context could be improved as this would help with the understanding of the rationale behind the site allocations.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			<p>Pg 17</p> <p>LNDP 2 Pg 19</p> <p>LNDP 3 Pg 20</p> <p>LNDP 4 Pg 21</p>	<p>a-<u>Page 17</u>: Map Extract 1 and Policy LNDP1 – Spatial Strategy and Settlement Boundaries The settlement boundary for Chichester will be considered for amendment in due course as part of Chichester District Council's work on the Local Plan. Any amendment to the settlement boundary of Chichester at Roman Fields and land at Maddoxwood should therefore await this process and be removed from the neighbourhood plan. <u>Map Extract 1</u>: It would be helpful if the names of the various gaps were identified on the map, either by referencing or the name of each in the key.</p> <p>b-South Downs National Park This policy (and the following paragraph relating to 'Justification') refers to 'All development (both inside and outside the South Downs National Park).....' It is considered that this should more accurately refer to development that affects the setting of the SDNP rather than seeking to apply a blanket provision for <u>All</u> development outside the SDNP.</p> <p>Local Gaps Question why the small area of land to the east of Lavant Road has been excluded from the identified gap as currently shown in the pre submission Neighbourhood Plan (Map Extract 1– Spatial Strategy). Is this an error?</p> <p>d-Delivering New Homes</p>	<p>The SG note the concerns raised by Chichester District Council. Amending / creating settlement boundaries within the plan area is within the remit of this neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>It is correct for the SG to consider all areas when reviewing the Settlement Boundary. The area in question undoubtedly complies with the criteria for inclusion within a settlement boundary.</p> <p>No change will be made to the submission plan.</p> <p>Comments noted. Policy wording will be amended to be relevant when development impacts the setting of the National Park.</p> <p>This area of land doesn't meet the criteria for Local Gap as 'Assessed in the Open Spaces Evidence Bank' Pages 6 and 7. It also fails on Criteria 5 ..'preventing Coalescence ' as other side of the road is built up already. Reviewed but no action required</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Reference;- Housing Needs Evidence Base Doc/ Rural Housing Needs Survey CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(cdc contd)	LNDP 24 Pgs 48 – 49	<p>Summersdale Garage and Maddoxwood</p> <p><u>Object to allocation LNDP24 – Summersdale Garage and Maddoxwood circa 20 dwellings</u> as there is insufficient justification for the inclusion of this site. The site is not currently required to meet any overall housing provision for Lavant.</p> <p>In <u>relation to wastewater</u>, the site would require connection to Apuldram WwTW and the headroom is unlikely to be available. In this respect CDC would not want to be in a position where there is a need to reject previously developed sites in Chichester on the basis of the inclusion of the site at Maddoxwood.</p> <p>With regard to Apuldram WwTW, there is currently limited capacity and the headroom has been allocated to delivering the Parish numbers set out in the Adopted Local Plan for Chichester, Fishbourne and Donnington. These numbers are being delivered through sites allocated in the Site Allocation Development Plan document that was consulted on in January 2016 or in Parish neighbourhood plans. The proposal for this site has not been accounted for and it cannot therefore be guaranteed that there would be headroom available</p>	<p>Evidence Base . this site is referred to in CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL Local plan</p> <p>No evidence provided by CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL to support comment. Is part of Detailed Planning Application</p> <p>Refer to justification: Housing Needs Evidence Base Doc/ Rural Housing Needs Survey CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL Evidence Base which CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL has supported and accepted. ALSO this site is referred to in the CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL SHLAA as neither included nor excluded although it has been referenced CC08254B. NAR</p> <p>See amendment as above: added under ISSUES <i>A connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network will need to be made, as advised by the service provider.</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
		(cdc contd)	<p>LNDP 10 Pg28</p> <p>LNDP 10 Pg28</p>	<p>to meet the proposal in the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan as the Council has a commitment to deliver the objectives set out in its Development Plan Document for the Local Plan Area.</p> <p>Local Green Space The sites that are to be designated as Local Green Space (in terms of the NPPF) need to be identified as part of a specific policy and cross referenced on the map. Currently they are listed in the text of paragraph 6.04 and not formally designated as part of a policy. For their inclusion there needs to be sufficient evidence in terms of the criteria set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>In this respect CDC object to the inclusion of The 'Amphitheatre' next to Centurion Way as this does not comply with the criteria set out in the NPPF; it does not form part of a green space that is in reasonable proximity to the community it serves as CDC considers that it is more closely related to provision for Chichester and the wider area, rather than providing local provision for Lavant. In addition, it is questioned whether the land identified is too extensive (criteria 3 of the para 77 of the NPPF) to be included in such designation. There is no reason that this land may be considered to be under threat from development and therefore there is currently no need of further protection.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The policy designates Local Green Space on the Neighbourhood Development Plan Map. This is standard practice, there is no need to name every space in the policy. Each space has been assessed as part of our Assessment of Open Spaces and this can be found in the evidence base.</p> <p>Objection noted but the SG disagree with the comments made by Chichester District Council.</p> <p>The area in question is much used by Lavant residents, and residents of Chichester for that matter, with many being able to get to the area within 5-10 minutes of walking.</p> <p>With regard to the land being an extensive tract this is open for discussion as there are no set definitions. The SG consider that whilst the views from the area can be far ranging the area proposed for designation is not an extensive tract and whilst larger than other proposed areas of Green Space is a clearly defined area.</p> <p>It should be noted that the comments made by Chichester District Council that there <i>"is no reason that this land may be considered to be under threat from development and therefore there is currently no</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 12 Pg31	Retention of assets of community value The process of registering community assets does not constitute a land use policy. This policy should aim to protect community facilities in themselves rather than supporting the process of registration. Further guidance on the registration process is available from the Community Team at CDC.	<p><i>need of further development” are largely irrelevant as the Local Green Space designation should be applied to “green areas of particular importance to [the local community]” (NPPF para 67). Whilst it did not influence the assessment it should also be noted that this assertion was incorrect in light of the recent options published for the A27.</i></p> <p>Give consideration to amending the wording of points 6.08-6.12 such that the LNDP intent is to protect, rather than to register in order to protect.</p> <p><i>Suggestion:</i> 6.08 <i>In England an asset of community value is land or property of importance to a local community.</i> 6.09 <i>Community consultation has identified a number of buildings and facilities that are considered to be of community value.</i> 6.10 <i>Irrespective of whether or not an asset is registered with the Local Planning Authority, this policy provides guidance to decision makers on development proposals that would impact a local community asset. Lavant Parish Council will seek to protect assets of community value.</i> POLICY: <i>Development proposals affecting valued community assets or facilities will be supported where it can be demonstrated the development will be of benefit to the local community. Development proposals that would result in the loss of a valued asset or facility or in significant harm to the community value of that asset or facility, will only be supported where it can be clearly demonstrated that</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			<p>LNDP 13 Pg 32</p>	<p>Local Biodiversity Opportunity Areas Question whether the land included in the area of BOA is accurate. It appears to include areas identified in the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies (2015) (Appendix A, Map A.1 West of Chichester wider ecological network) as barn owl habitat; suggest the areas are checked.</p>	<p><i>the operation of the asset of facility is no longer viable.</i></p> <p><i>6.11 Through consultation the community has identified a number of community assets which are important for community life. These buildings and spaces are set out in the Community Matters document within the evidence base.</i></p> <p><i>6.12 Voluntary and community organisations can nominate an asset to be included on their local authority's register of assets of community value. This is a separate legal process initiated by the Parish Council but undertaken by CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL. The inclusion of these sites on the Local Planning Authority's register of Assets of Community Value will provide the Parish Council, or other community organisations within the Parish, with an opportunity to bid to acquire the asset on behalf of the local community once placed for sale on the open market. Separately therefore, the Parish Council will undertake an exercise, outside of developing its NDP, to register these community assets; and it encourages the community to support registration to ensure the retention of assets of community value into the future.</i></p> <p>The areas mapped have been provided by the South East England Biodiversity Forum and are considered accurate.</p> <p>It is accepted that map extract 3 is confusing, there is too much information on it making it difficult to distinguish the designations. To rectify this the information will be split into two maps.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
			LNDP 14 Pg 34	Suggest policy wording is reconsidered, as currently worded the policy seems to seek development in order to create enhancement rather than protection of the BOA. In addition, the policy provides a blanket policy for <u>All</u> development which again is unlikely to be realistic.	The policy is drafted to apply to all development within the Biodiversity Opportunity Area, the wording is considered to be appropriate.
			LNDP 18 Pg 38	Landscape Character and Key Views It would be helpful if the specific views identified and listed in paragraph 7.09 are referenced and identified on the map.	Agreed.
			LNDP 23 Pg 47	New Public Rights of Way Neither the map (Map Extract 4) nor the text is clear on what is to be achieved by this policy. There is no link between the introduction of a new public right of way, if that is what is intended, and any development proposals that may contribute to its provision. The routes/lines (identified on Map Extract 4 – Transport and Infrastructure) are not easily discernible and may be difficult to implement.	Amend wording to say 8:05 to 2 nd bullet point remove Mid Lavant Churchmead..' <i>between Village Green and Children's Play area</i> '
				Eastmead Industrial Estate Concern with regard to the proposals for this site in terms of loss of employment. Eastmead is the main employment site within Lavant and there may be severe implications for the sustainability of the whole area, not just Lavant, if it is lost. <u>The Estate is a major employment site</u> to the north of Chichester which balances out the geographical location of other employment sites to the west, south and east of the city. The loss of the employment site would be considered likely to damage the sustainability of the area.	Change 8:05 'omit 'any new development' change to ' <i>development contributions will be used to facilitate</i> '
					Modify marking on Map extract 4 to make clearer.
					Point noted Site is not a ' <i>major employment site</i> ' NAR

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Steering Group Comment
				<p>Exercise of Delegated Authority - Head of Planning Services I hereby exercise my delegated power in accordance with Chichester District Council's Constitution: 'to make formal comments on a draft Neighbourhood Plan at Pre-Submission stage and Submission stage'</p> <p>AND DETERMINE THAT, the above comments are the formal response made by Chichester District Council Planning Policy on the pre submission stage of the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan in relation to comments made under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended by The Neighbourhood Planning (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015):-</p> <p>Signed: Andrew Frost Head of Planning Services Date: 26 April 2016</p> <p>Note: The deadline for making representations should not be less than 6 weeks from the first day the draft plan was publicised.</p>	
029	26/04/16	Sarah Nelson SDNP		ALL SHEETS REPRODUCED BELOW. PLEASE CONTACT ME IF YOU WANT ME TO SEND YOU A COPY BY EMAIL.	

Ref Comment

SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council

General Comments

-We understand the ambitions of the NDP to ensure that previously experienced issues with a lack of parking are not replicated. However, as worded we are concerned that the levels of parking to be required are excessive and could lead to an excess of urbanizing features and limit the areas that can be put aside for open space, landscaping etc. As currently written a 3 bedroom property would require we believe 4 parking spaces?

LNDP19

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
	Suggest the policy is reviewed and that potential unintended consequences are considered. Suggest wording provides for greater flexibility and allows parking to be based on what exists in the area and what is most appropriate for the site. Tandem parking may be the only solution that enables this level of parking to be achievable.	Amend wording pg40 LNDPA19 Policy Box (b) 'half a space per dwelling rounded up to the whole number)
		<p data-bbox="1615 392 1809 416"><u>Tandem parking</u></p> <p data-bbox="1615 459 2159 612">Amend –delete current wording Pg 40 Policy Box(c) replace with '<i>Tandem parking will be permitted and is defined as two spaces including garage space/s</i>'</p>
	Transport Statement – Confirmation needs to be sought on whether a Transport Statement will be required to support the NDP should it ultimately allocate more homes than was anticipated in the SDNPA Local Plan: Preferred Options. If this is the case it may be possible to incorporate this into the current transport assessment and modelling work being undertaken on the South Downs Local Plan.	Amend - 8:14 (pg 41) to delete last sentence ' <i>Ensuring.....</i> '
	<p data-bbox="271 759 1563 895">Transport Statement – Confirmation needs to be sought on whether a Transport Statement will be required to support the NDP should it ultimately allocate more homes than was anticipated in the SDNPA Local Plan: Preferred Options. If this is the case it may be possible to incorporate this into the current transport assessment and modelling work being undertaken on the South Downs Local Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="271 935 465 959">1.0 Introduction</p>	
1.11	2 nd bullet – Typo, National Park Chichester District	Agreed
	3.0 About Lavant	
3.01	The SDNPA considers Lavant to be in the Coastal Plain rather than the Dip Slope	Change made
3.09	Description of Lavant	Wording now reads:
	The CDC landscape Capacity study is not a landscape character assessment and therefore should not be used to inform on landscape and visual impacts (in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013'). The South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (SDILCA) is the main evidence base for Landscape Character in the SDNP, secondary sources would include the West Sussex Land	The South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment 2011 describes landscape character in the South Downs National Park. It is the main evidence base

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
	<p>Management Guidelines; The Future Growth of Chichester Study (CDC), CDC Capacity study and other local Landscape Character Assessments including parish based studies. The SDILCA is described as being an update of the capacity study which it is not, it is a standalone landscape character assessment.</p>	<p>for landscape in the SDNP. Further evidence may be found in the following studies, particularly relevant where sites are on or near to the boundary of the SDNP where the SDILCA may not cover all of the relevant landscape/countryside:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Sussex Land Management Guidelines/LCA (WSCC) • Future Growth of Chichester Study (CDC)(attached) • Chichester Capacity Study(2005 CDC) • Village design statements/parish plans/Local LLCAs
	<p>4.0 Spatial Strategy</p>	
LNDP1	<p>Settlement Boundary Review</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Following discussions (with SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY) the SG have chosen to adopt a locally specific criteria to facilitate the inclusion of this site.</p> <p>Should read LNDP 21, 22, 26?</p>
	<p>We broadly support the proposed settlement boundary and application of the SDNPA methodology, with the exception of change no. 006. The inclusion of this greenfield, non- residential site of indeterminate usage (until recently scrubland) within the boundary is inconsistent with criterion 17 of our methodology; the sample list of greenfield uses in that criterion is not intended to be exclusive. If there is a specific local reason why this site should be included in the boundary then it would be helpful to set this out.</p>	
	<p>The proposed settlement boundary maps do not clearly show the alignment of the current settlement boundary at Riverside, Mid-Lavant.</p>	
	<p>Policy LNDP1</p>	

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
LNDP2	<p>Reference to policies LNDP 23 – 28 is incorrect.</p> <p>..... characteristics of the National Park and its setting. In particular development should not adversely affect the public views towards.....</p> <p>Suggest inclusion of additional wording in the policy - <i>'The assessment of development proposals should demonstrably refer to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment 2011'</i></p> <hr/>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Comments noted. Policy will be amended to include all 7 special qualities and the requested working will be added.</p>
LNDP3	<p>Local Gaps</p> <p>It is unclear why part of one field south east of the primary school has been left out of the Local Gap, and apparently not assessed for its potential as such, given that (a) the remainder of the field is designated as a Local Gap and (b) the importance of this part of the field in views from the footpath network towards the village edge.</p>	<p>This area of land has been reviewed in the context of other Sites and Village views . The strategic gap will be extended up to South corner of Lavant Primary School plot to the bridge over Centurion Way. ; - The area currently excluded will be redefined as the SW portion fulfils criteria 2 and 5 for Local Gap (see Open Spaces Evidence Bank). The NE portion doesn't meet the criteria .</p> <p>Amend map Extract 1 to include area behind school.</p>
LNDP4	<p>The policy makes provision for at least 75 new dwellings. Given the protected landscape in which Lavant sits it is considered justified to amend this to say the provision of approximately 75 new homes. This wording when taken to have its normal meaning indicates to the village and developers that this is not providing</p>	<p>Support for the ambition to meet Local housing need noted.</p>

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
	<p>the green light for significantly higher levels of housing than agreed through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>In principle the SDNPA supports the bold response of the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan to the need for housing to meet local needs. This is supported by emerging SDNP Local Plan policy SD23: Housing (criteria 5) which states that <i>'Development that meets an identified local housing need in settlements, in addition to the requirements set out above, is identified in neighbourhood plan and is in compliance with Policy SD22 (Development Strategy) and other relevant policies in this Local Plan will be supported'</i>. The South Downs Local Plan: Preferred Options indicated that the NationalPark would be looking for in the region of 20 homes to be allocated in Lavant. Whilst the allocation of 75 by the Neighbourhood Plan seems in excess of this, it should be noted that LNDP24 (20 homes – Summersdale Garage and Maddoxwood) are not in the National Park and that the SDNPA remains to be convinced about the redevelopment of LNDP23 (30 homes – Eastmead Industrial Estate) – see further comments later on in response.</p>	<p>Support noted regarding bold response.</p> <p>Comments regarding sites noted.</p> <p>Policy wording will be changed from 'at least' to 'approximately'</p>
4.23	As above	Change made.
5.0	General Development Principles	
LNDP6	d)undesignated historic heritage assets and their settings.	Agreed – replace <i>historic</i> with <i>heritage</i>
LNDP7	<p>The policy sets a particularly rigid housing mix. However there probably needs to be some flexibility on smaller sites for it to be deliverable. Larger sites are better able to reflect requirements identified in the CDC Housing Need Study.</p> <p>Affordable housing requirement goes above adopted Local Plan policy (currently CDC Local Plan – 20% on sites 5-9 and 40% on sites 10 or more). The emerging SDNP Local Plan policy states that a target of at least 40% of all dwellings on schemes of 6 or more units will be provided as affordable homes.</p> <p>50% affordable housing is unlikely to be achievable on individual sites, but it may be possible across the plan area with some Community Land Trust delivery if a willing landowner could be identified e.g. the Rectory site (100% affordable)?</p>	<p>Amend first para in Policy LNDP7 . <i>change '3' to '5'</i></p> <p><u>Affordable housing requirement</u> NDP7: Comment noted. Wording changed to "affordable housing will be provided in accordance with policies set by the appropriate planning authority. "</p>

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
	Recommend splitting the policy into separate housing mix & affordable policies.	Recommend splitting the policy_ Declined
	Align affordable housing policy with adopted Local Plan or remove from Lavant NDP entirely and rely on strategic level plan which will be the most up to date.	LNDP7 aligned with adopted Local Plan.
LNDP12	Query whether this policy applies to just Assets of Community Value or does it apply to a broader range of community facilities within the Parish.	Consider scope of policy. Wording has been broadened to include the phrase <i>asset or facility</i> Felt that the list within Community Matters Doc is sufficient NAR
7.0	The Environment & Sustainability	
LNDP13	BiodiversityOpportunityareas–itisgoodtoseereferencetosuchareaswithinthepolicy. From an applicant’s point of view it would be helpful for them to know where further information on what they need to do in relation to each BOA was.	Provide further information on where information on BOAs can be found. include address and website details Relevant documents are referred to in the appendices.
LNDP14	7.07 - Suggest the description of landscape elements should include 'agricultural land and rolling topography, the steep sided valley of the Lavant, and the ridge of the chalk downs.'	Changed, now at 8.08.
	Policy LNPD14	
	Also suggest the following wording replaces the policy on assessment of impacts:	
	'Applications should be supported by a landscape assessment in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013'. Such an assessment should be proportionate to the proposed scale of development and the degree and extent of any likely impacts on the landscape. The study should be undertaken by a chartered Landscape Architect. The applicant is advised to agree the scope of such a study	' Remove 2 nd paragraph in policy box Replace with <i>'Where development has a harmful impact on landscape character or open views, the development will not be permitted unless the proposal can demonstrate mitigation can be achieved on</i>

Ref**Comment**

with the LPA prior to commencement.'

SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council

land within the applicant's control and will reduce any harm to an acceptable level. 'Applications should be supported by a landscape assessment in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013'. Such an assessment should be proportionate to the proposed scale of development and the degree and extent of any likely impacts on the landscape

Agreed (in modified form) see below

'Applications must be supported by a landscape assessment in accordance with the 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013'. Such an assessment should be proportionate to the proposed scale of development and the degree and extent of any likely impacts on the landscape.

Key views

There is concern that the map and list suggest that no other views are important. The map could be amended to show just the location and direction of views. SG decision to retain list as is more specific

We also suggest that the following views are included if a list of views is to be retained and should also be shown on the map:

SG decision to retain and expand the list as it is felt important to set down clear expectations for developers.

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
<p>i. Views from the footpath north of Summersdale towards Lavant and the Trundle - identified as an important view from Chichester in the 'Future Growth of Chichester Study', ref figure 5.6 of that report</p> <p>ii. View over the 'amphitheatre' from the Centurion Way where Kingley Vale is visible in the distance. - also identified as an important view from Chichester in the 'Future Growth of Chichester Study', ref figure 5.7 of that report agreed add these ALSO note SDNPA consider the 'Amphitheatre' to come under LNDP.</p> <hr/>	<p>Change wording of 7:09 (now 8.10) from to read '<i>a number of particularly important views which include..'</i></p> <p><i>Views from the footpath north of Summersdale towards Lavant and the Trundle - identified as an important view from Chichester in the 'Future Growth of Chichester Study', ref figure 5.6 of that report. Addition agreed.</i></p> <p><i>View over the 'Amphitheatre' from the Centurion Way where Kingley Vale is visible in the distance. - also identified as an important view from Chichester in the 'Future Growth of Chichester Study', ref figure 5.7 of that report. Addition agreed.</i></p>	
LNDP17	<p>Conserving and enhancing local heritage assets All proposals that have the potential to directly impact, or impact on of the</p> <hr/>	<p>Broaden remit of policy, in addition it is suggested that the heritage assets be marked on a map.</p> <p>Amend second para of policy to read: "<i>All proposals that have the potential to directly impact, or impact on the setting of the following must provide a heritage statement demonstrating that the impacts do not detract from the assets' significance: ...</i>". Wording changed as suggested.</p>

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
8.0	Transport & Infrastructure	<p>Amend 7.22 to read: <i>“...any development that impacts these assets will be expected to demonstrate how those impacts do not detract from the assets’ significance: ...”</i>. <i>Wording unchanged as felt the original provided more appropriate.</i></p> <p>Map of heritage assets available in Evidence Base.</p>
LNDP19	Off-Road Parking in Residential Developments –	<p>We understand the ambitions of the NDP to ensure that previously experienced issues with a lack of parking are not replicated. However, as worded we are concerned that the levels of parking to be required are excessive and could lead to an excess of urbanising features and limit the areas that can be put aside for open space, landscaping etc. As currently written a 3 bedroom property would require we believe 4 parking spaces?</p> <p>Suggest the policy is reviewed and that potential unintended consequences are considered. Suggest wording provides for greater flexibility and allows parking to be based on what exists in the area and what is most appropriate for the site. Tandem parking may be the only solution that enables this level of parking to be achievable.</p> <p>LNDP19 Amend wording pg40 LNDPA19 Policy Box (b) ‘half a space per dwelling rounded up to the whole number). Wording amended as suggested.</p> <p><u>Tandem parking</u></p> <p>Amend –delete current wording Pg 40 Policy Box(c) replace with <i>‘Tandem parking will be</i></p>

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
		<p><i>permitted and is defined as two spaces including garage space/s'</i></p> <p>Amend - 8:14 (pg 41) to delete last sentence 'Ensuring.....' Wording amended as suggested.</p>
LNDP20	Effective Traffic Management - Development proposals that require the creation / alterations of roads shall where applicable:	Comment noted.
<hr/>		
9.0	Site Specific Policies	
LNDP21	<p>Land adjacent Pook Lane</p> <p>We note both the reference to opening up a historic vista and also the removal of trees in order to create an access. This implies there may be multiple loss of trees and in taking forward this allocation we suggest that a tree survey/arboricultural impact assessment in accordance with BS5837 should inform the development proposals including the point of access from the A286 (also in accordance with highways authority recommendations).</p> <p>With regard to the replacement football pitch, we have assumed that the proposals would be similar in nature to those already in the village but we would wish this to be clarified. We also suggest that the site is assessed for the proposal - although it is 'only' football - pitches normally require certain characteristics - ie a flat site, good drainage and paths, fencing and access, all of which could affect the river valley character if executed poorly (particularly levels) and will change the character of this area from agricultural to more formal in feel.</p> <p>The pedestrian crossing point for the new football pitch and existing public footpath is quite treacherous & it is suggested that traffic calming measures are needed along the lane as part of this site based policy in accordance with LNDP20.</p> <p>We anticipate that concerns may be raised by CDC Archaeologist and Historic England in relation to the impact on the Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p>	<p>Comment by SG (following site meeting 31/August with SDNPA, CDC Archaeological Officer – also acting for Historic England and Landowner’s representative)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of trees to create access. <i>Trees along the A286 west boundary were identified as in need of serious attention with only the best species that will need to be kept. Thus creating an appropriate access should not be a problem</i> 2. Clarify like-for-like football field and impact on river valley. <i>Like for like football field with no lighting confirmed. Pitch to be located along eastern (flatter) side to avoid any disturbance to the</i>

Ref	Comment
	<p>As a result of the sensitivities of the proposal we would be happy to work with LNDP group in firming up the proposals and exploring the issues and opportunities available so that any forthcoming planning application is of the highest possible standard and is supported by all the necessary information.</p>

Policy LNDP21

The policy states 'up to 12 dwellings'. We query whether 'approximately 12 dwellings' would give more flexibility. The allocation is very small for the site and with good design would be capable of being accommodated without significant harm to long distance views. It is located within an area of low density housing, so development will need to respond to this and include an assessment of these views (and all other views) in a landscape assessment for the site whilst also maximising the potential in order to achieve the a good mix and some affordable housing.

The detailed layout will be really important to get right as the proposals have several frontages - to the Devils Ditch, Lavant Road and Pook Lane, then new public open space to the east.

SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council

- entrenchment. Hedge screening to east edge of field retained.*
- 3. Treacherous crossing and traffic calming measures. *Footpath from Raughmere to be extended along north boundary of football field and cross to Memorial Hall parking via a raised platform (speed table) to control the traffic in Pook Lane.*
- 4. Concerns may be raised by CDC archaeologist and Historic England on impact on scheduled monument. *Some development likely to be acceptable. Substantial open space retention would be the key. Indicative development area should be acceptable but dependent on detail of the design.*
- 5. SDNPA happy to work up proposals with the SG. *Site Meeting convened on 31/August 2016 to review/ agree the core issues.*
- 6. Number of dwellings. *Density to be appropriate for the location but numbers not considered the key issue. Policy amended to approx. 15 but primary concern is to realise the site constraints including optimising the views from the new public access alongside the entrenchment.*

Ref	Comment	SDNPA Recommendation to Lavant Parish Council
	Criteria 4) We would like to ensure that there is no anticipation that this football pitch be floodlit now or in the future.	<p>7. Detailed layout very important to get right. <i>Up-revved Concept Masterplan to be included within the plan but if approved a detailed masterplan will be required. Properties bordering the A286 should be orientated on to the road as elsewhere with an appropriate set back.</i></p> <p><u>Criteria 4</u> Add further text to clarify that floodlighting will not be accepted as part of the proposal. Covered under Dark Skies Policy</p>
LNDP22	<p>Church Farm Barns Include reference to the importance to consider views from south in the set of issues.</p> <p>Policy LNDP22 Suggest that the policy should explicitly require the retention and reuse/conversion of the older flint and brick barns and that new development should be compatible in scale, design and form with the existing retained barns.</p>	<p>NAR already covered in Policy</p> <p>NAR already covered in Policy</p>
LNDP23	<p>Eastmead Industrial Estate</p> <p>We note that this a current employment site. Recent pre-application advice was sought on a scheme for 100% housing on this site. In response the Economic Development Service at Chichester District Council raised a strong objection to such a proposal and see Eastmead industrial Estate as a major employment site to the north of the city which balances out the geographical location of other employment sites to the west, south and east of the city. The loss of the employment site would be considered to damage the sustainability of the area. Recent work by officers at the District Council has confirmed that there is a high level of occupancy at the site. Please provide evidence. The impending provision of the Council's Enterprise</p>	<p>The SG will continue to work with the SDNPA and all parties to address the various concerns insofar as they impact on the Draft Policies.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

Centre means that within two years of completion it is expected that 50 companies a year would be expected to move on from the centre. Therefore there is considered to be a long term need for accommodation such as this for businesses. Current evidence indicates there is a high demand for business space, given the take up of converted farm buildings and low vacancy rates on industrial estates.

The emerging South Downs Local Plan: Preferred Options Policy SD28: Employment Land (criteria 3) states that *'The Authority will safeguard all existing employment sites and allocations that are fit for purpose from development proposals for non-employment uses. Evidence of a robust marketing campaign of at least 12 months will be required that clearly demonstrates that there is no market demand for the business premises.'* With this in mind we question whether all the buildings are no longer fit for purpose as the accompanying text appears to imply and whether sufficient work has been done to ensure that the site can remain in full employment use.

However, we acknowledge that the policy seeks to ensure that 40% of the site remains in employment use. We seek further information on how this 40 / 60 split has been arrived at.

In terms of any detailed design and layout considerations, due to the sloping nature of the site, it is exposed to views from the surrounding countryside and would therefore require careful consideration in terms of height and design of buildings. This would also be a relevant consideration in terms of impacts upon local residents and the site is at a higher level than housing to the east on Lavant Down Road and surrounding areas. Conversely, the site lies at a lower level than Bleaches Court to the west and this will also need to be considered in the design.

Policy LNDP23

The policy requires the provision of public open space etc in the centre of the development. This is supported but the 'Concept Proposal' included within the Assessment of potential development sites document does not show this and it is questioned whether the site is able to accommodate employment land, housing (including parking requirements set out in LNDP19) and a useable level of open space.

Reconsider suitability of site for allocation.

Reconsider capacity of site to provide all the elements set out in the draft policy.

Question capacity of site. In addition it is suggested that the policy includes a requirement for an integrated Green Infrastructure approach to surface water drainage which incorporates a range of above ground flood

Points noted, works continues to address this issue. Independent assessment of Confidential Assessment of Options for the site has been undertaken – commissioned by LPC, funded by developer.

Comment noted. Matter addressed in independent assessment.

NAR. Noted and agreed. Careful master planning will be required once overall strategy for the site agreed. Covered by LNDPPolicies 5-7

NAR. Noted and agreed. Developer's Concept Proposal doesn't comply with our Policy and is not part of the LNDP.

Comments noted, but site still considered to be suitable.

Noted. Add to LNDP15 as new paragraph

prevention measures - eg rain gardens, swales, green roofs, ditches this would be consistent with local landscape character.

To read ' New developments to include an integrated Green Infrastructure approach to surface water drainage which incorporates a range of above ground flood prevention measures - e.g. rain gardens, swales, green roofs, ditches to be consistent with local landscape character.'

LNDP24 Summersdale Garage & Maddoxwood House Policy LNDP24

3rd bullet – we question how achievable access to Centurion Way might be considering the changes in levels.

The retention of Summersdale Garage and shop is now proposed is supported as it contributes to vitality/sustainability of the community.

access to Centurion Way Changes in level are not in themselves a constraint – it is just a matter how this is best achieved.

LNDP25 'village hub' mean?

This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016

Concern that policy is suggesting parking that would impact the churchyard & setting of the listed building

This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016

Policy LNDP25

4th bullet – In the first instance we would seek a design and layout which limits the need for screening planting. It would be a pity to screen the church and graveyard from public view.

LNDP26

The Rectory

This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016

The site is within Flood Zone 2 and we question whether an increase in residential development will be appropriate given that there are clearly alternative locations within the village in which it can go. In addition the land is allocated for 100% affordable housing which may result in placing some of the most vulnerable and least able to afford insurance in the community in an area of known risk.

The development of the site requires the provision of a new Rectory, yet this is not then followed through in the policy and we question whether the site is actually available for 100% affordable housing given the existing use value that is likely to be attached to it.

We fear that economics will impose an over-intensive solution. The house on the site, though undistinguished architecturally, will have quite a substantial market value and implies that the replacement housing will need to be quite intensive to make it viable

In addition to this, although we have not inspected the ‘curia’ to the rear of the site it were to turn out to have some interest this could put further consequential pressure on the remaining area of the site.

Finally we have concerns that the development of this site may harm the character of the conservation area.

SA/SEA

4.09 The Parish Council will be assessing the impact of new development on the landscape qualities of the National Park and considering those that will have minimal impact.

Noted, this was an error – SA updated

4.10 Sustainability objective 7 - to encourage and support new businesses could be incompatible with the neighbourhood objectives LOB2 and LOB3 which prioritise brownfield and derelict land and promoting housing development on specified sites. There may be examples where employment sites or sites with an existing employment use are considered suitable for housing. The Neighbourhood Development Plan will need to assess the impact of this in the employment use and consider options to provide alternative or enhanced business space if required.

6.02 In the absence of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, it is considered there will be fewer opportunities to address the issues and challenges facing Lavant. Without the Plan, opportunities for the following issues may be comprised:

Noted – SA Updated

Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)

We would recommend that the position as far as HRA is clarified with both Lavant Parish and Natural England as there appears to be no record on file that an HRA screening opinion has been provided. The HRA for SDNPA's Preferred Options LP was based upon an allocation of 20 homes in Lavant and this made reference to possible impact pathways including recreational pressure on Kingley Vale SAC and water quality / quantity impacts, recreational disturbance and loss of supporting habitat on Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA, SAC and Ramsar

Natural England have been approached and a response is awaited.

However, given that NE were consulted on the SEA, they would have had the opportunity to raise a requirement for an HRA at this stage.

Assessment of potential development sites Study

Suggest it would be helpful to identify those sites within the SDNP and those that are not.

Noted

Suggest Stage three assessment should include reference to the Future Growth of Chichester Study by LUC for CDC in 2004. This is part of CDC local plan evidence base and it identifies views over and towards the parish which should be referenced in the NDP.

Noted

The football field assessment (site 3) does not refer to the need to identify alternative sites for the football facility and there is no assessment of the new football field provision proposed in LNDP21. Suggest this should be undertaken.

Noted

Open Space Assessment

Query the difference in assessment between sites 12 (Strip of land next to the playground and south of Churchmead Close) and 13 (The grassed verge north of Lavant Down Road) which share similar functions and characteristics.

Comment noted. Distinction retained as functions are similar but not the same.

Review of heritage Assets

Para 1.25 states that there are no sites within Lavant recorded at present on the local heritage at risk register. Noted – document updated. However, there is no acknowledgement that the national heritage at risk register (maintained by Historic England) lists four entries for Scheduled Monuments at risk within the parish – one of which (Devil's Ditch, section 230yds (210m) long from Chichester main road to Pook Lane, Lavant, Chichester) and forms part of site allocation LNDP21. This should be acknowledged within this document and within the main LNDP policy for site LNDP21 – including any ongoing maintenance requirements that could be sought through the development of the site (Advice from Heritage England should be sought).

In addition it would be beneficial for either this document or the main LNDP document to include photographs of some of the parish heritage assets as, although they are identified on the LNDP map, there may still be some confusion/uncertainty with some descriptions (eg “The West single track crossing over the river Lavant”).

Other Comments

Sewerage capacity - There is a history of groundwater infiltration of the sewerage system in Lavant that peaked in 2012 and resulted in periodic release of sewerage discharge into the Lavant because of capacity issues at Lavant treatment works. There is a direct impact pathway from this to heightened nutrient levels in Chichester Harbour. Southern Water is re-lining sewers in the area but we are unaware whether this work has been completed and the extent to which it has improved capacity during periods of prolonged, heavy rainfall. Suffice to say if the work is not yet complete, 75 new homes in an area that already has capacity issues, will exacerbate the situation. Clarification on this issue with Southern Water is important to ensure that the approval of new development does not outstrip capacity on the local sewerage network with consequential impacts on the Chichester Harbour European sites. Comments noted.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
030	28/04/16	Luke Vallins Terence O'Rourke Goodwood Estate	Q1a Q1b	Yes Yes Public consultation on the Lavant Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission (Draft) Document.	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Goodwood Estate contd)</i>		<p>On behalf of our client, The Goodwood Estate Co Ltd, we are pleased to submit representations in respect of the Pre-Submission (draft) version of the Lavant Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).</p> <p>Please find attached to this letter a completed official response form, which was published alongside the consultation. In addition, this letter expands upon the information provided in the response form, given the limited space available.</p> <p>Representations are made in respect of the following elements of the draft NDP, which will be discussed in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy LNDP4 – Delivering New Homes • Policy LNDP17 – Conserving and enhancing Local Heritage Assets • Policy LNDP22 – Church Farm Barns <p>In addition, further to a phone call with Ian Hutton, the chair of Lavant Parish Council, we have been advised to use the current consultation to re-submit a number of sites that were submitted on 6 February 2015 as part of the 'Call for sites' undertaken by the parish. Eight sites were submitted through this consultation via both email and post, but we understand the submission was not received. This resulted in all but one site (Site 9 – Church Farm Barns), which we understand the parish had previously been made aware of, not being subject to the Lavant NDP assessment of potential development sites.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>The following sites are therefore re-submitted for consideration by the parish in the format of the original submission, details of which are enclosed with this letter and response form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 1 – Land North West of Lavant Road • Site 3 – North of Pook Road • Site 6 – Lower Road Car Park • Site 7 – Land North of Lower Road • Site 8 – Land South East of Lower Road • Site 8A – Land East of Fordwater Road • Site 10 – Parker's Stables 	<p>Sites 1 - 2 Duchess properties close to railway line. Would be brought forward as a potential small development site under LNDP20.</p> <p>Site 3 – Pook Lane property, listed building. included as small development site under LNDP20.</p> <p>Site 6 – car park and house near Royal Oak. Occupied listed building. included as small development site under LNDP20.</p> <p>Site 7 – Vacant plot at entrance to Lower Road. Included as small development site under LNDP20.</p> <p>Site 8 – Duchess cottage style building. No historical asset value. Occupied. Included as small development site under LNDP20.</p> <p>Site 8A – greenfield site backing onto extensive gardens of properties along Lower Rd. As part of preparation of Settlement Boundary of East Lavant extensive large gardens were specifically excluded from being included in SB. This site abuts these gardens, it is a greenfield site on a slightly raised prominent area and was deemed totally inappropriate for development. Site subsequently withdrawn.</p> <p>10 – subsequent to original submission amended to 10 and 10A, following SG response in conjunction with SDNPA, suggested repurposing the stable building only (land behind inappropriate for development) – subsequently site 10 withdrawn in totality including the stable building.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Goodwood Estate contd)</i>	<p style="text-align: center;">LNDP 4</p> <p data-bbox="696 375 974 406"><i>Delivering New Homes</i></p> <p data-bbox="696 406 1556 726">The Estate is broadly supportive of this draft policy, which outlines plans for the provision for at least (our emphasis) 75 new dwellings on allocated sites over the plan period, particularly the delivery of circa five dwellings on the Church Farms Barn site. However, the Estate considers that there may be a need to review the draft allocations identified through this policy following the re-submission of its sites for consideration, as well as their subsequent assessment based on the methodology outlined within the Assessment of Potential Development Sites document.</p> <p data-bbox="696 726 1556 1093">Following this assessment, it may <u>be necessary for the NDP to make further housing allocations</u>, possibly resulting in an increase in the number of new dwellings that the NDP makes provision for, rising more towards or beyond the upper end of the housing need identified through the housing needs survey undertaken in May 2014 of 55 – 89 dwellings. This would result in the need for further site-specific policies. It is important to remember that the issue of housing need is greater than the Neighbourhood Plan area, relevant to the objectively assessed need of the wider planning authority area.</p> <p data-bbox="539 1125 696 1157" style="text-align: center;">LNDP 17</p> <p data-bbox="696 1125 1265 1157"><i>Conserving and enhancing Local Heritage Assets</i></p> <p data-bbox="696 1157 1556 1412">While the Estate acknowledges that some of the structures on the Church Farms Barn site may be considered to be of heritage value by the local community, for the avoidance of doubt, this policy should make reference to the specific historic barns on the site that are collectively deemed a local heritage asset, rather than the Church Farm Barns as a whole. When discussing the existing structures at the site, the supporting document Review of Heritage Assets in Lavant notes</p>		<p data-bbox="1556 406 1780 438">Comments noted.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 478 2143 694">Housing numbers are driven by need and the SG considers that the correct number of new dwellings has been established. The housing need will be reviewed when the Neighbourhood Plan is reviewed or comes to the end of its plan period.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 766 2143 869"><u>be necessary for the NDP to make further housing allocations</u>, Noted. Lavant is in National Park, this remark is not applicable. NAR</p> <p data-bbox="1556 1197 2143 1380">Amend wording in both Main document LNPD17 2(h) AND 1.02 (9) and <u>Review of Heritage Assets</u> 4.03 (9) in Doc 10 page 12 .to read “<i>Church Farm Barns, historic structures, Fordwater Lane, East Lavant</i>”</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Goodwood Estate contd)</i>		<p>that “The modern (Inc. asbestos) have no historical or architectural significance.” The parish therefore appears to accept in this review that the newer structures / later additions should not be included in the local heritage asset policy, but this is not directly apparent when reading the policy as drafted, which seems to apply to the barns generally. As any scheme to develop the site would likely involve demolition of these newer structures / later additions, it is important to ensure that unwarranted heritage status that may impinge the ability to deliver housing is not attributed to them. In light of this, the enclosed plan (entitled Church Farm Barns) has been prepared to identify the structures that the Estate considers this policy could apply to. We also propose additional wording for this policy as underlined below:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“h. Church Farm Barns, Fordwater Lane, East Lavant (<u>as identified in figure xx of this plan</u>)”</p> <p>In addition, it is important to ensure that any residential development proposals for the Church Farm Barns site (as proposed through draft policy LNDP22) is not unduly constrained by their status as a local heritage asset such that a scheme is not deliverable. The Estate supports the suggestion that any proposals should conserve and enhance the heritage features of the barns, and not detract from the designation criteria outlined within the supporting text to draft policy LNDP17. However, to ensure that any proposals are deliverable, particularly in the context of viability, the NDP should incorporate sufficient flexibility, for example, in the case of the Church Farm Barns site, so not to preclude additional works or the erection of structures (e.g. garages) alongside or attached to the existing barns.</p> <p><i>Church Farm Barns</i></p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 22	<p>The Estate fully supports the proposed allocation of the Church Farm Barns site for the provision of circa 5 dwellings. In order to assist in the interpretation of the policy, specific reference should however be included in the supporting text to the site also containing “modern (Inc. asbestos) [structures that] have no historical or architectural significance.”</p> <p>As noted above in relation to comments on policy LNPD17, as currently drafted, the policy and supporting text suggest all of the existing structures on the site are of historic value. We propose the wording underlined below in order to clarify this point:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i><u>“Church Farm Barns are a semi-derelict brownfield site containing both historic and modern (including asbestos) structures.”</u></i></p> <p>As outlined above, as there may be a need for additional works or the erection of structures alongside or attached to the existing barns to ensure delivery of a viable scheme, it is important to ensure that the wording of the policy is not unduly restrictive.</p> <p>The underlined text below is proposed to address this issue and maximise the potential for a deliverable scheme to be brought forward for the site that contributes towards meeting the local housing need identified through the NDP:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i><u>“This site is allocated for the provision of circa 5 dwellings. In addition to according with the policies contained within the development plan, development of this site should accord with the following criteria, insofar as is practicable in the context of viability considerations:.....”</u></i></p> <p>It is also considered essential to make direct reference to the intention of the draft policy, which is to seek the re-use or conversion (our</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>9.07 Agreed – amend text <i>Church Farm Barns are a semi-derelict brownfield site containing both historic and modern (including asbestos) structures.”</i></p> <p>Not agreed. Viability issues not relevant to LNPD</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>emphasis) of the historic structures. This is implied through bullet point three, which the following comments from the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) (as per its report to the planning committee meeting on 14 April 2016) also appear to make reference to, along with bullet point four:</p> <p><i>"...welcome the additional criteria re. historic structure although suggest that the policy should explicitly require the retention and reuse/conversion of the older flint and brick barns and that new development should be compatible in scale, design and form with the existing retained barns"</i></p> <p>In light of the Estate's and the SDNPA's comments, the wording of bullet points three and four of this draft policy should be amended to include the text underlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"The existing historic structures (older flint and brick barns) should be retained, restored and re-purposed (re-used / converted). In doing so it should remain obvious what the original purpose of the buildings were.</i> • <i>Any new development should be compatible in scale, design and form with the existing retained barns, whilst any new structures should be no taller than the adjacent farmhouse to the north of the site."</i> <p>Furthermore, the SDNPA comment that the policy should <i>"include reference to the importance to consider views from the south in the set of issues"</i>. The Estate considers that this could be incorporated into bullet point five as per the underlined text below:</p> <p><i>"The design and style of the development should reflect the East Lavant settlement and <u>demonstrate that views from the</u></i></p>	<p>Bullet 3 – amended to: <i>"The existing historic structures should be retained, restored and re-purposed (re-used / converted). In doing so it should remain obvious what the original purpose of the buildings were</i></p> <p>Bullet 4 – amended to: <i>"Any new development should be no taller than the adjacent farmhouse to the north of the site."</i></p> <p>Agreed this is important gateway to East Lavant/Goodwood Estate. Combine with suggestions from SDNPA:</p> <p>Bullet 5 amended to: <i>"The design and style of the development should reflect the character of the historic farmstead and East Lavant</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p><i><u>south have been considered and are reflected in the proposed design approach.</u></i></p> <p>The Estate would welcome the opportunity to discuss the representations made in this letter, or the development potential of any of the sites re-submitted, with the Parish Council further.</p> <p>I trust that these representations will be duly noted, but please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any clarification or further information.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Luke Vallins MRTPI Senior Planner.</p> <p>Documents to be attached under separate cover</p>	<p><i>settlement typology. Views from the south must be considered and are reflected in the proposed design approach."</i></p>
031	28/04/16	Patrick Barry Eastmead (Wyg/Oakford Homes)		<p>Representations – Pre-submission Neighbourhood Development Plan Contents</p> <p>1.0 Introduction 2.0 Representations 3.0 Conclusions</p> <p><u>1.0 Introduction</u></p> <p>1.1 WYG Planning and Environment has been instructed to submit representations on the Pre-submission Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan. The site is being promoted for redevelopment jointly by the landowner and our client, Oakford Homes.</p> <p>1.2 These representations look at the implications of policies contained within the Draft Plan and how they would guide appropriate development, and ensure deliverability of the proposed allocations. The approach being adopted by the Parish Council within this</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Patrick Barry Eastmead contd)	LNDP 7	<p>document is broadly supported and we welcome the inclusion of land at Eastmead Industrial Estate as a proposed allocation within the plan. However, we have some concerns regarding policies which depart from the adopted Development Plan. In particular we have concerns regarding the soundness of Policies LNDP7 and LNDP19. We also have concerns over the terms of the proposed allocation under Policy LNDP2. Detailed representations are provided at Section 2.0 below.</p> <p><u>2.0 Representations</u></p> <p>Policy LNDP7 – New Dwelling Sizes & Affordable Housing</p> <p>2.1 We have concerns over the requirements of Policy LNDP7 in terms of how it relates to affordable housing requirements in the adopted Development Plan and the overly prescriptive nature of the housing mix requirements.</p> <p>2.2 With regard to the 50% affordable housing requirement as proposed, this does not reflect existing affordable housing policies in either the adopted or emerging Local Plans at Chichester District Council (CDC) or the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) respectively. The 40% affordable housing requirement in the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan (Policy SD24) is based on a relatively recent viability assessment to establish what is economically viable for new developments. The proposed 10% uplift in this requirement goes beyond what has been established as being a viable level of affordable housing and no evidence has been presented with the Draft Policy or the accompanying text to justify this position. We note that the proposed policy does allow for a relaxation of this requirement where a viability case is put forward however the requirement should be set at a viable level as a starting point. We suggest that the requirement be reduced to 40% and the viability</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			(LDNP 7 contd)	<p>provision retained in accordance with emerging SDNPA Local Plan Policy SD24.</p> <p>2.3 As an aside issue, the accompanying text refers to Policy 34 of the Chichester Local Plan. It is our understanding that this Plan relates to the part of Chichester District which lies outside of the South Downs National Park and as such it should not feature in a policy which relates to development proposals in the South Downs National Park.</p> <p>2.4 Policy LNDP7 also sets very specific housing mix requirements for new development based on a 2014 local housing needs survey. Whilst we do not question the identified needs, the study simply provides a snapshot at a particular point in time whereas the Draft Plan period runs for 15 years and there is a genuine concern that the policy in its current form does not provide enough flexibility to respond to needs as they change over this period.</p> <p>Therefore it is our consideration that the policy should be simplified with reference to identified needs at the time of the planning application. These needs are regularly reviewed and updated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and therefore this could be referenced within the Draft Policy as a means of establishing the need at a given point in time.</p> <p>Policy LNDP19 - Off-road Parking in Residential Development</p> <p>2.5 a- <u>The wording of the proposed policy is unclear</u>, particularly in setting out what is required by criteria (a) and (b). We assume that criterion (a) requires a minimum of 2 spaces for all one bedroom dwellings and 1 space per bedroom for all dwellings with two bedrooms or more, e.g. 3 spaces for a three bedroom dwelling. It is unclear whether the visitor parking requirement is 0.5 or 1.0 spaces</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .															
		<i>(Patrick Barry (Eastmead contd)</i>		<p>account the rise in car ownership levels, as the calculator uses the TEMPRO database to bring car ownership levels to 2026 and future proof the parking requirements. On this basis the technical and statistical rationale behind the proposed increase in parking standards is considered inconsistent and it represents an unsound departure from WSCC standards which have been subject to great scrutiny prior to their adoption as part of the Development Plan.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="701 550 1518 807"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="701 550 864 659">60 units</th> <th data-bbox="864 550 1028 659">Resident (Allocated)</th> <th data-bbox="1028 550 1191 659">Resident (unallocated)</th> <th data-bbox="1191 550 1355 659">Visitor</th> <th data-bbox="1355 550 1518 659">Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 659 864 735">WSCC calculator</td> <td data-bbox="864 659 1028 735">91</td> <td data-bbox="1028 659 1191 735">16</td> <td data-bbox="1191 659 1355 735">12</td> <td data-bbox="1355 659 1518 735">119</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="701 735 864 807">Draft Plan standards</td> <td data-bbox="864 735 1028 807">169</td> <td data-bbox="1028 735 1191 807">0</td> <td data-bbox="1191 735 1355 807">30</td> <td data-bbox="1355 735 1518 807">199</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2.8 In addition to the inconsistencies highlighted above, the WSCC Calculator has a number of benefits over the proposed standards in the Draft Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft Plan does not take into account the <u>different parking requirements</u> of flats or affordable dwellings, which are widely considered to have a reduced parking demand. • The Draft Plan does not provide any <u>differentiation between allocated and unallocated</u> parking provision requirements, with unallocated parking widely accepted to be a more appropriate and land-efficient type of parking for certain dwelling types. 	60 units	Resident (Allocated)	Resident (unallocated)	Visitor	Total	WSCC calculator	91	16	12	119	Draft Plan standards	169	0	30	199	<p><u>parking calculator</u> Noted/ NAR, ref Schedule 9 Part 2 (6) localism Act 8:13</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
60 units	Resident (Allocated)	Resident (unallocated)	Visitor	Total																
WSCC calculator	91	16	12	119																
Draft Plan standards	169	0	30	199																

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			(LNDP 19 contd)	<p>2.9 Alongside our concerns regarding the technical justification behind the proposed parking standards in the Draft Plan, the adoption of these standards <u>would have significant detrimental impacts on developers' general ability to</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) deliver a high quality layout; and 2) make efficient use of land. Implementing the required level of parking outlined by the Draft Plan would result in the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a car-dominated environment which is less attractive to cyclists and pedestrians; • Increase hard surfacing resulting in additional surface water run-off; • Reduce opportunities for landscaping; and • <u>Prohibition of tandem parking</u> results is overly wide driveways and dropped kerbs <p>These impacts are completely at odds with the principles of good design generally, which encourages a sharing/minimising of hard surfacing in as much as possible. There is an even stronger emphasis on landscape-led design in National Parks and we are concerned that proposed approach would at best hinder developers' ability to deliver good quality external environments on sites due to the predominance of hard surfacing.</p> <p>2.10 In addition to the issues highlighted above, the proposed parking requirements would significantly undermine the viability of Eastmead Industrial Estate as an allocation. The redevelopment of this or any other Brownfield site will inevitably generate a significant amount of upfront costs in terms of demolition, decontamination etc. The delivery of new commercial floorspace on the site as part of any mixed-use scheme will also represent a significant cost and is unlikely</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><u>would have significant detrimental impacts</u> Comment noted.</p> <p><u>Prohibition of tandem parking results</u> Amendments made to LNDP19 to allow some tandem parking.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Patrick Barry Eastmead contd)</i>		<p>to generate an equivalent return value in the short-medium term. These costs need to be recouped in the values generated by the residential development in order to make a mixed-use scheme viable and in this context the proposed parking standards would result in a significant amount of hard surfacing at the expense of land for residential development. Given the village setting of the site the loss of residential land cannot be offset through vertical density and in this respect it would be very difficult to bring forward a viable proposal which complies with this policy.</p> <p>2.11 With these considerations in mind we suggest that the policy be amended to reflect the current WSCC Parking Standards.</p> <p>Policy LDNP23 - Eastmead Industrial Estate</p> <p>2.12 We support the allocation of the site for mixed-use development and the criteria contained within the policy align with our client's aspirations to deliver a high quality scheme that will enhance the character and appearance of Lavant. However, we have significant concerns regarding the split of residential and non-residential development proposed in the allocation and by association the number of residential dwellings allocated to the site. These concerns are based on viability work that has been undertaken on behalf of the client by Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL). JLL were commissioned by the client in 2015 in response to increasing vacancy issues on site and the lack of interest in marketed units. They were tasked with a brief of assessing the site's current status and providing development options going forward. As part of this brief JLL were advised that current and emerging planning policies require the retention of existing employment land where viable and as such any proposed development options should focus on compliance with the policy position and not simply revert to a whole-scale residential redevelopment.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Patrick Barry	(LNDP 23 contd)	<p>We have reviewed this document in detail and it is lacking the site specific assessments that were undertaken in the 2009 report. Consequently, there is no assessment on how the site is performing against the cautionary comments from 2009. It may be that this work was not within the scope of the assessment but the existing vacancy levels on site and the trends in vacancy since 2009 are clear evidence that the cautionary comments in the ELR were well founded. Since 2009 the site has continued to decline despite the economic recovery and ongoing marketing efforts by commercial agents.</p> <p>2.14 With the above vacancy issues in mind and also having regard to the planning policy position which seeks to retain employment land, the JLL report looks initially at the potential redevelopment of the site in its entirety for new employment floorspace. However, this was found to be completely unviable. As a secondary assessment JLL looked at a mixed-use redevelopment of the site to create new employment floorspace together with residential accommodation. This financial model would see the capital receipts from the residential development cross-subsidising the employment development. This led to a viable solution whereby 25% of the site would be developed for employment use and the remainder of the site would provide housing to fund the employment floorspace and redevelopment costs generally. The JLL report states that this solution is very sensitive in viability terms and any additional employment land-take on the site would make this scheme marginal or unviable. With this in mind the current allocation, which requires 40% of the site to be retained for employment land, is not a viable proposition. Similarly, the level of residential development (30 dwellings) will not generate sufficient capital to cross-subsidise the delivery of new employment floorspace.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Eastmead contd)		<p>2.15 It is clear from the work undertaken by JLL that the site's employment role is not Representations – Pre-submission Neighbourhood Development Plan sustainable without significant investment/redevelopment. It is also clear that the local residents of Lavant are supportive of redevelopment of the site but would like to see this redevelopment come forward as a mixed-use scheme. As such, we need to find a policy that delivers the maximum amount of new employment floorspace within a viable financial model. The terms of the current allocation do not achieve this balance; instead the policy could potentially jeopardise redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>2.16 This could be rectified in two ways –</p> <p>1) the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group could instruct the Valuation Office to independently appraise the JLL report, in particular the split between residential and non-residential development, to establish whether the JLL assumptions on viability are correct. This could be used to define the terms of a revised allocation for the site. The client will provide an undertaking to fund this appraisal but the instruction would need to come directly from the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group;</p> <p>or</p> <p>2) the terms of the allocation could be amended to remove the existing specific breakdown on residential and non-residential development, with the inclusion of a viability clause as follows: This site is allocated for mixed-use development (to include light industrial & office uses). The split between residential and non-residential development in any proposal for the site should be based on viability evidence and should seek to maximise the retention of employment use. In addition to the policies contained within the development plan,</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>development of this site should accord with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a large site this requires an imaginative and inspirational concept design that strikes the correct balance between open space and built development. The residential element should be no denser than that of the immediate surroundings. • Public open and recreational space should be at the centre of the development and not as space that is left over after planning. • A pedestrian access to/from the north-east of the site should be provided. <p>3.0 Conclusions</p> <p>3.1 WYG Planning and Environment has been instructed to submit representations on the Pre-submission Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan. The site is being promoted for redevelopment jointly by the landowner and our client, Oakford Homes.</p> <p>3.2 The approach being adopted by the Parish Council within this document is broadly supported and we welcome the inclusion of land at Eastmead Industrial Estate as a proposed allocation within the plan. However, we have some concerns regarding policies LNDP7, LNDP19 and LNDP2.</p> <p>3.3 The concerns over policies LNDP7 and LNDP19 relate to the lack of evidence presented in departing from standards contained within current and emerging policies in the Development Plan. The policies seek to introduce more onerous standards which, contrary to the intended objectives, will detrimentally impact on both the viability and design quality of new development. With regard to the proposed affordable housing requirement, this needs to be independently</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>assessed to establish whether or not it is viable as is standard practice for any affordable housing policy in a Local Plan. Whilst we understand the motivation behind the proposed parking standards, we feel that there has been a disproportionate increase in the standards based on the evidence presented with the policy.</p> <p>3.4 With regard to the proposed allocation of Eastmead Industrial Estate, we are supportive of a mixed-use allocation in principle. However, in light of the work undertaken by JLL we are concerned that the proposed split between residential and non-residential development is not viable. We have submitted the JLL report alongside these representations to substantiate our concerns and we would encourage the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to review the policy on this basis. We have presented two potential options which would rectify our concerns and we will look to meet with the Steering Group to further discuss this matter at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Viability Assessment under separate cover – commercially sensitive and not for Public Domain</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The proposed policy in relation to affordable housing (LNDP7) has been amended to reflect local policy set by the relevant LPA. The SG consider that policies relating to off-road parking provision (LNDP19) are justified within the parish for the reasons set out in the Plan and supporting Evidence Base. In addition, it is considered that the NPPF supports the use of policies to ensure parking provision reflects local needs.</p>
032	28/04/16	Amanda Sutton For Seaward Properties	Q1a Q1b	<p>Yes Support in part. Please refer to representations</p> <p>TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED) REPRESENTATIONS TO THE LAVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (2016-2031) Pre-Submission Plan (March 2016) Land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage, Lavant Road On behalf of: Seaward Properties Ltd</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>CONTENTS</p> <p>1.0 Introduction</p> <p>2.0 Basic Conditions of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(i) Have regard to national policies</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(ii) Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(iii) Conform with strategic policies contained in the development plan</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(iv) Be compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements</p> <p>3.0 Proposed Allocation of Land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage, Lavant Road</p> <p>4.0 Pre-Submission Plan Policies</p> <p>5.0 Conclusions 13</p> <hr/> <p>1.0 Introduction:</p> <p>1.1 Neame Sutton Limited, Chartered Town Planners, is instructed by Seaward Properties Ltd to submit representations in respect of the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031, Pre-Submission version (April 2016).</p> <p>1.2 These representations relate to land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage, Lavant Road, which is being promoted by Seaward Properties on behalf of the Landowners, and follows Seaward Properties previous assessment and subsequent proposals (May 2015), which demonstrated that the site is suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>1.3 The site comprises 0.9ha of land and falls within two separate land ownerships, the residential property Maddoxwood (0.5ha), and Summersdale Garage (0.4ha).</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>1.4 The residential property Maddoxwood is positively assessed within Chichester District Council's SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) May 2014, and confirms that the site is available, suitable and achievable capable of accommodating a residential development of 12 units in the period 2019-2024 (ref: CC08254B).</p> <p>1.5 The Pre-Submission Lavant Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage for 20 dwellings under Policy LNDP24.</p> <p>1.6 Seaward Properties endorse the allocation of its site, and in this respect, these representations seek to support the continued allocation through the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>2.0 Basic Conditions of the Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p>2.1 The Government wants to put power back in the hands of local communities and introduced neighbourhood planning in the Localism Act 2011, to enable local communities to take a more involved role and shape their future by establishing general planning policies for development and the use of land in their neighbourhood.</p> <p>2.2 However, there are some basic conditions that must be met in order to comply with the legislation (paragraph 8 (1)(a) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act specifically refers).</p> <p>1.3 In order to meet the basic conditions, a Neighbourhood Plan must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have regard to national policies; • Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; 	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan; and • Be compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements. <p><u>(i) Have regard to national policies</u></p> <p>2.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance(PPG), sets out a whole suite of policies relating to a wide range of issues, including in particular transport, housing, design, climate change, the natural environment, and the historic environment.</p> <p>2.5 The Lavant Neighbourhood Plan sets out the vision, objectives and policies for the next 15 years up to 2031, and is founded upon the need to achieve sustainable development having regard to the 3 dimensions of sustainable development set out in national policy, namely, an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.</p> <p>2.6 With regards to housing, the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges the high degree of market pressure for housing within Chichester caused by a multiple of factors, including past under delivery of housing against targets, proximity to London, higher than national average of second home ownership, and seeks to ensure that the needs of its community can be met by the allocation of additional land for housing over the next 15 years.</p> <p>2.7 As such, the Neighbourhood Plan has been positively prepared and proactively seeks to meet the future needs of the local community in an environmentally sensitive manner, and having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>	LNDP 7 LNDP 10	<p>2.8 The spatial strategy for the Parish has been tested in the SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) to ensure that it does not result in material harm to the areas of acknowledged importance.</p> <p>2.9 Furthermore, the vision for the Parish has been the subject of extensive consultation and reflects the views of the majority of the local community.</p> <p>2.10 This aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to pass the test set out in Basic Condition 1.</p> <p>2.11 However, whilst the policy wording is sufficiently clear so as to be applied in decision making, in some instances they are overly prescriptive and undermines the delivery of sustainable development, notably Policy LNDP7 (New Dwelling Size and Affordable Housing and Policy LNDP10 (Off-Road Parking in Residential Developments). As currently drafted, Seaward Properties is concerned that they fail to meet Basic Condition 1. Consequently, Seaward Properties has put forward suggested amendments as set out in Chapter 4 of these representations such that this test can be passed.</p> <p><u>(ii) Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development</u></p> <p>2.12 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which the Government advises should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking (paragraph 14).</p> <p>2.13 The NPPF advises that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development, an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.</p>	<p>The proposed policy in relation to affordable housing (LNDP7) has been amended to reflect local policy set by the relevant LPA. The SG consider that policies relating to off-road parking provision (LNDP19) are justified within the parish for the reasons set out in the Plan and supporting Evidence Base. In addition, it is considered that the NPPF supports the use of policies to ensure parking provision reflects local needs.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>2.14 The proposed allocation of land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage for housing under Policy LNDP24 comprises a sustainable development having regard to the following:</p> <p>An economic role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is in an accessible location with access to a cycle and pedestrian network that provides easy and convenient access to those services and facilities available within Chichester City and the immediate environs, and thus assists in securing their long term viability; • The site is available immediately and will therefore contribute towards economic growth. <p>A social role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivers a range of housing to meet an identified need; • Delivers infrastructure improvements secured via Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) towards education, fire service, community facilities, library and playing fields. <p>An environmental role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal makes best use of previously developed land in a sustainable location; • The site can be readily assimilated into the environment in a sensitive manner; • Site protects the special qualities of the South Downs National Park; • Site is physically and visually contained. 	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p>LNDP 7 LNDP 19</p>	<p>policy requirements on development that will place an undue burden on and constrain the delivery of housing land.</p> <p>2.19 Such policy burdens within a Neighbourhood Plan undermines the viability of development and prevents the delivery of sustainable development as envisaged by the Parish.</p> <p>2.20 Consequently, Policies LNDP7 and LNDP19 are not considered to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan and would not meet this Basic Condition 3. Further details of Seaward Properties concerns in relation to these policies are set out below under Chapter 4.</p> <p><u>(iv) Be compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements</u></p> <p>2.21 The principal relevant EU obligation is under the EC directive on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (strategic environmental assessment, or SEA) (Directive 2001/42/EC). That requires, where plans and programmes are likely to have significant effects on the environment, that an environmental assessment be carried out at the time they are prepared and before they are adopted.</p> <p>2.22 A SEA Scoping Report was published by the Parish Council for consultation with the statutory authorities to complete Stage A of the SEA process. The comments received were taken into account in Stages B and C of drafting the SEA alongside the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan, which was published for consultation with the statutory authorities as well as the general public.</p> <p>2.23 Whilst there is no specific legal requirement within the Regulations for Neighbourhood Development Plans to undertake their</p>	<p>The proposed policy in relation to affordable housing (LNDP7) has been amended to reflect local policy set by the relevant LPA. The SG consider that policies relating to off-road parking provision (LNDP19) are justified within the parish for the reasons set out in the Plan and supporting Evidence Base. In addition, it is considered that the NPPF supports the use of policies to ensure parking provision reflects local needs.</p> <p>The proposed policy in relation to affordable housing (LNDP7) has been amended to reflect local policy set by the relevant LPA. The SG consider that policies relating to dwelling size (LNDP7) and off-road parking (LNDP19) are justified within the parish for the reasons set out in the Plan and supporting Evidence Base. They are not contrary to Policies within the Development Plan, instead they build upon them providing more clarity on what is required locally within the Parish.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>own Sustainability Appraisal, it provides a useful tool to the development and consideration of the policies and overall strategy of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>2.24 The Lavant Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that the Parish Council has given full consideration of sustainability issues affecting the village and provides the means for assessing the options and mitigating against any negative impacts where possible. Undertaking this process therefore assists the Parish Council in meeting the requirements of this Basic Condition.</p> <p>3.0 Proposed Allocation of Land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage:</p> <p>3.1 The Neighbourhood Plan and background evidence base, including requirements of the EU Directive 2001/42 for Strategic Environmental Assessment, has tested the suitability of the proposed allocated site on land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage and demonstrates that it is a suitable site that accords with the sustainability objectives of the NPPF and Chichester Local Plan policies.</p> <p>3.2 Lavant Parish Council consulted extensively with key stakeholders and the local community on the options available for housing over the next 15 years, with those now proposed for allocation within the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan reflecting the collective vision of the local community.</p> <p>3.3 Seaward Properties support and welcomes the identification of its site as one of the preferred options to accommodate the future growth of the Parish. The site is not only suitable for the type and amount of proposed development but also available and achievable, as follows:</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>Suitability:</p> <p>3.4 Land at Maddoxwood is positively assessed in the Chichester District Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which confirms that the site is capable of accommodating 12 units (ref: CC08254B).</p> <p>3.5 In addition, the site has been assessed in relation to the following technical matters, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Trees: <p>3.6 The site is not currently covered by any statutory or non-statutory designations for landscape character or quality, albeit the South Downs National Park boundary lies circa 650m to the north.</p> <p>3.7 The West Sussex Landscape Character Assessment (2003) describes the site as lying within the South Coast Plain – Halnaker Upper Coastal Plain Fringes - SC7 and describes the area as a transition between the open lower Coastal Plain to the south and the wooded South Downs to the north.</p> <p>3.8 A landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) carried out in relation to Seaward's Roman Fields residential development to the south, found that the existing tree and vegetation belt along the sites western boundary and woodland to the north provide very effective screening of the site from the wider landscape, and that housing development on the site, if carefully designed, would cause only localised visual effects.</p> <p>3.9 The existing trees and vegetation will be retained and incorporated into the design proposals for the site.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>3.10 Accordingly, the tree belts will continue to screen proposed housing on the site from the wider landscape, which can therefore be readily assimilated without compromising the principles set out in the Landscape Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settlement Separation: <p>3.11 The site comprises an existing previously developed site and does not therefore currently offer any open views. Furthermore, the site, which fronts onto the Lavant Road and is visible from it, does not extend into open countryside but is instead physically and visually contained between residential development under construction to the south, and a block of protected woodland to the north. This area of woodland is a strong landscape feature with open countryside beyond further to the north that is protected from development.</p> <p>3.12 In allocating the site, the Parish Council have accepted that the proposed housing allocation would not be harmful to the objectives of the local gap, because of its contained nature, and that it would not result in the actual or perceived coalescence of the settlements of Chichester and Lavant. Seaward Properties support the removal of the site from the Local Gap and allocation for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology: <p>3.13 The site and its immediate environs are not the subject of any statutory or non-statutory designations recognised for their nature conservation interests.</p> <p>3.14 Furthermore, the site comprises the residential property Maddoxwood and its domestic curtilage, and therefore the ecological value of the site is considered to be low.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>3.15 Consequently, the potential presence of any protected species is not considered to represent an overriding constraint to the site being brought forward for residential development.</p> <p>3.16 Seaward's emerging proposals will ensure that the proposed development will have no long term, adverse impacts on local wildlife and nature conservation interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways and Transportation: <p>3.17 The site is in an accessible location with access to a safe cycle and pedestrian network that provides easy and convenient access to the services and facilities within Chichester City and the immediate environs.</p> <p>3.18 The site already benefits from an existing access to serve the residential property Maddoxwood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Risk and Drainage: <p>3.19 The site is situated within flood zone 1 on the Environment Agency's flood risk mapping and is not therefore at risk of flooding from either fluvial or surface water flooding.</p> <p>3.20 Any subsequent proposal for housing will include the implementation of a sustainable drainage system that would not therefore increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, and therefore accords with the requirements of the NPPF in respect of flood risk and drainage matters.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<p>3.21 Having regard to the above, the proposed allocation for housing under Policy LNDP24 is suitable and achieves the aims of sustainable development.</p> <p>Availability:</p> <p>3.22 Seaward Properties has recently completed a high quality residential development on land immediately to the south, Roman Fields, and has direct experience of delivering a successfully integrated residential development within the Parish. Working alongside the landowners, Seaward Properties are the promoters and developers of land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage and are committed to delivering a high quality residential scheme.</p> <p>Achievable:</p> <p>3.23 Seaward Properties is keen to progress its proposals and have commenced with the preparation of a planning application which will be submitted to Chichester District Council for determination once the Neighbourhood Plan has gained sufficient weight.</p> <p>3.24 Having regard to the above, the allocation of land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage meets the requirements of general conformity as set out in the basic conditions and has good sustainability credentials and is considered to be able to a win a majority at a referendum.</p> <p>4.0 Submission Plan Policies:</p> <p>4.1 Generally the policies, as currently drafted within the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan are supported, and particularly:</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy LNDP1 – Spatial Strategy and Settlement Boundaries <p>SUPPORT – The Council has carried out an up to date settlement policy boundary review to guide future developments to those sequentially preferable sustainable locations, which has resulted in land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage, and Roman Fields to the south, being included within the defined settlement limits of Chichester City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy LNDP3 – Local Gaps <p>SUPPORT – The Parish Council has removed land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage from the Local Gap as it is acknowledged that the site is both physically and visually contained and does not contribute to the objectives of the local gap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy LNDP4 – Delivering New Homes <p>SUPPORT – Land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage is allocated for circa 20 dwellings.</p>	Comment noted.
			LNDP 3	<p>4.2 However, it is important to ensure that the Plan remains sufficiently flexible and does not seek to impose unnecessary policy burdens on proposed allocations so as to ensure the delivery of viable sustainable developments.</p>	
			LNDP 4	<p>4.3 As currently drafted Seaward Properties objects to Policy LNDP7 (New Dwelling Size and Affordable Housing and Policy LNDP19 (Off-Road Parking in Residential Developments), and considers they fail to meet Basic Condition 3, as follows:</p>	Comment noted.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>	LNDP 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy LNDP7 – New Dwelling Size and Tenure <p>OBJECT</p> <p><u>Housing Mix:</u></p> <p>4.4 As a starting point it is important that any policy forming part of the Development Plan provides for flexibility to ensure that it can respond to individual site circumstances including matters of character and design in particular.</p> <p>4.5 It is not therefore appropriate to seek to impose rigid requirements within a policy that must be applied to all development proposals regardless of site specific considerations. This approach fails the requirements of the NPPF and the NPPG in terms of promoting sustainable development.</p> <p>4.6 The approach that has been taken in the draft policy is overly prescriptive and may serve to affect the viability of individual development proposals. Whilst the Parish Council may wish to refine the housing mix requirements of the adopted Local Plan to specifically relate to the Parish of Lavant this should not be imposed in a restrictive manner. Furthermore the Parish Council has sought to go beyond the scope of the adopted Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 – 2029, which seeks in Policy 33(5) to ensure: 'The scheme provides an appropriate density of development. This will be determined by its immediate context, on-site constraints, the type of development proposed and the need to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings;....'</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Policy has been reworded to be less prescriptive, more flexible and therefore can respond to site specific conditions and constraints. We have amended the wording to enable a range of dwellings sizes and affordable housing to meet local need.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Seaward Properties contd)	LNDP 6	<p>4.7 Indeed, Neighbourhood Plan Policy LNDP6 requires development proposals to “a) reflect the density of the immediate surrounding area”.</p> <p>4.8 Revised wording within the policy to identify the desire for a greater proportion of smaller units to be provided subject to consideration of site-specific circumstances such as: immediate context; on-site constraints; the type of development proposed; and, the need to provide an appropriate mix of dwellings would represent a more flexible and appropriate approach that is consistent with that set out in Policy 33 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>4.9 This approach is supported by Paragraph 184 of the NPPF, which requires Local Planning Authorities to set out clearly their policies for the area, which in the case of housing mix Chichester District Council has done through Policy 33. As a consequence Neighbourhood plans should: ‘reflect these policies and neighbourhood plans should plan positively to support them.’</p> <p>4.10 The Parish Council’s current approach does not accord with Paragraph 184 because it seeks to impose a restriction on mix that goes beyond the flexibility set out in Policy 33 of the Local Plan. The flexibility in the Local Plan accords with the NPPF and acknowledges that the evidence base to support the consideration of housing mix (the Strategic Housing Market Assessment) will vary during the course of the plan period as it is updated on a regular basis.</p> <p>4.11 The policy should therefore be reworded to reflect the flexible approach set out in Policy 33 of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Affordable Housing:</p>	4:7. LNDP6 , Noted / NAR for this Specific Site LNDP24 Roman Fields development considered to be ‘ <i>the immediate surrounding area</i> ’ Site is allocated up to 20 dwellings

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>4.12 The Parish Council's proposal to introduce a 50% requirement for affordable housing with no minimum threshold is completely arbitrary and fails to accord with the approach set out in the adopted Local Plan (Policy 34).</p> <p>4.13 The evidence base that the Parish Council seeks to rely upon comprises a single Housing Needs Survey (May 2014), which identifies the need for open market and affordable housing based on the desires expressed by respondents to a survey. The document confirms the need identified to be indicative only.</p> <p>4.14 On the basis that the need identified comprises a snap shot in time and the figures presented are indicative only this cannot, on its own, comprise a robust or credible evidence base to justify a significant departure from the adopted Local Plan policy requirement of 30% provision set out in Policy 34 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>4.15 By contrast the approach taken by the District Council to identify a requirement of 30% provision has been based not only on an assessment of housing need, but also a detailed Strategic Housing Market Assessment and consideration of scheme viability to reach a robust conclusion in accordance with the methodology set out by Government within the NPPG.</p> <p>4.16 The Parish Council's approach therefore fails in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of credible evidence to support a departure from the Local Plan; • Not reflecting the methodology set out in the NPPG; and, 	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Seaward Properties contd)</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not present any evidence or demonstrate that any consideration has been given the matter of scheme viability. <p>4.17 The last point above is of particular importance. Within Chichester District the Local Planning Authority reached the position that 30% provision would be appropriate having regard to need and importantly what could viably be delivered on any particular site. Put simply, if a higher percentage could have been delivered viably based on the evidence then Local Plan Policy 34 would have sought that higher percentage.</p> <p>4.18 The Parish Council's approach is not viable and not supported by credible evidence. It also fails to positively support the recently adopted Local Plan policy position, which is a requirement of Paragraph 184 of the NPPF.</p> <p>4.19 As a consequence it is necessary for the policy to be amended to bring it into line with Policy 34 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 – 2029.</p> <p>4.20 In its current form draft Policy LNDP7 is unsound unless the changes identified above are made.</p> <p>Policy LNDP19 – Off-Road Parking in Residential Development - OBJECT</p> <p>4.21 Seaward Properties considers that draft Policy LNDP19 is unsound on the basis that it seeks to impose a car parking requirement within the Parish that is overly prescriptive, inflexible and, not in accordance with the adopted parking standards set out for the District as a whole.</p>	<p>4:17 LNDP agreed to go with CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL policy. OMIT: the first two sentences that refer to circa 30 dwellings and 40% of the land being retained for employment uses. ADD: this site is allocated for an appropriate mixed-use development comprising C3 residential and an element of B1 employment uses. The precise mix is to be determined by a viability assessment agreed between SDNPA and the owner/developer as part of any planning application. The new development should maintain the site's ability to contribute to the wider Chichester economy.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP19	<p>4.22 Due to the overly prescriptive nature of the policy the wording is contradictory and could not therefore reasonably be complied with.</p> <p>4.23 In the first instance criterion (a) requires all parking to be on plot for houses with a minimum of 2 spaces per unit. For houses and family housing in particular it is usual for on plot parking to be provided via a mix of driveway and garaging usually in a tandem formation. Criterion (c) however states that tandem parking is not allowed. If both criteria were to be adhered to in strict terms this would result in houses being either served by wide garages (minimum two car width) or by wide driveways that dominate the streetscene resulting in poor design and layout and a low quality of residential environment.</p> <p>4.24 The policy therefore needs to be simplified to tie into the adopted parking standards for the District as a whole and, at the most, to express a desire for increased provision in Lavant where the site-specific circumstances and design considerations will allow.</p> <p>5.0 Conclusion:</p> <p>5.1 Seaward Properties support the allocation of 20 dwellings on land at Maddoxwood and Summersdale Garage under Policy LNDP 24 of the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan (April 2016), and agree that when tested against the alternatives the site is the most appropriate location for housing.</p> <p>5.2 However, whilst the Pre-Submission Plan is considered to meet the majority of those basic conditions, Seaward Properties is of the view that as presently drafted Policy LNDP7 (New Dwelling Size and Affordable Housing and Policy LNDP10 (Off-Road Parking in Residential Developments), fail the test in that, for reasons set out in Chapter 3 of these representations, they do not conform with those strategic policies contained in the Development Plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy wording now reads <i>“All residential development must include provision for adequate off-road parking spaces including garages as set out below. In new developments, every dwelling should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Provide within its curtilage (or within the development) 2 parking spaces or 1 parking space per bedroom, whichever is greater; AND</i> <i>(b) Include provision for adequate visitor parking (0.5 spaces per dwelling rounded up to the nearest whole number).</i> <p><i>Development proposals affecting existing</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Lock Family and Ashmarden Ltd contd)	LNDP 3	<p>We recognise the hard work and time that has been spent formulating the draft plan and we would like to support the plan moving forward. However, we do have a few areas of concern for which we would like to suggest modifications.</p> <p><i>Local Gap (Policy LNDP 3)</i></p> <p>We note that a large proportion of land around the village and adjoining the village boundary has been allocated as a local gap. Whilst this policy does potentially allow for appropriate development, it sets strict and subjective requirements. Realistically, this means most forms of development will be restricted when in some locations and under other certain circumstances could be considered as suitable and sustainable.</p> <p>Our particular concern is with the allocation of land south of the village boundary. The justification for this allocation in the entire stretch between Lavant and Chichester is appeal decision APP/L3815/A/13/2200123 and the fact that the land was allocated as a Strategic Gap. The District Policy relating to Strategic Gaps has been removed through the adoption of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Chichester is a highly sustainable settlement and the allocation of all land to the south of the Parish, adjoining the Chichester City boundary, restricts development of the city at a future date. Currently, there is not the capacity for expansion to the east south or west of the city due to environmental or highway constraints.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires sustainable development to be approved without delay. The NPPF also requires planning authorities to deliver a five year housing land supply and also boost this supply wherever possible. You may be aware that whilst the Chichester Local Plan has recently been adopted, the housing numbers</p>	<p>Comments noted. The LNDP provides for sustainable development within the Parish and is in general conformity with current local and national policy. The LNDP also allocates land for residential development adjacent to Chichester in an appropriate location at Maddox Wood. Development of areas to be allocated as Local Gap is considered to be unsustainable. For more information, please refer to the evidence base.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 23	<p>adopted are less than the objectively assessed need and the examiner has requested that a review of the plan take place within the next few years.</p> <p>Additional sites in sustainable locations will be required. Whilst we are not suggesting that this tranche of land will be suitable for development, we do not think that it is suitable to restrict development on land adjoining major sustainable settlements. Policies within the Local Plan already restrict development in the countryside whilst an up to date Local Plan is in place and there is little justification for this designation to restrict development further.</p> <p><i>Site Allocations (Policy LNDP23)</i></p> <p>We note that Policy LNDP23 allocates land at Eastmeads Industrial Estate for 30 dwellings. This site is currently an employment site located within the National Park. We recognise that, as a general principle, housing should be focussed on brownfield land wherever possible however, one of the key principles outlined throughout the South Downs Local Plan Preferred Options (2015) is that employment opportunities should be retained and improved wherever possible throughout the park.</p> <p>The pre-application enquiry for 61 dwellings clearly states that an occupancy rate in excess of 95% was witnessed on a site visit. The Economic Development response states that 'there is currently strong evidence to suggest that there is a high demand for business space, as evidenced by the take up of converted farm buildings and low vacancy rate on industrial sites' and that 'The loss of this employment site would irrevocably damage the sustainability of the area'. Our concern is that insufficient information has been provided to justify why this employment use is no longer suitable when its removal would be contrary to National Park principles and damaging to the local area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. LNDP23 is a reflection of community needs and wishes.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Lock Family and Ashmarden Ltd contd)	<p>LNPD23</p> <p>LNDP 13</p>	<p>Other sites have been identified in the village without such constraints and could be capable of accommodating additional numbers. In addition, other sites south of the village and adjoining Chichester have been issued with restrictive designations when they are in fact sustainable and will not have a detrimental impact on the National Park principles.</p> <p><i>Biodiversity Opportunity Area (Policy LDNP 13)</i> Land to the east of Lavant Road and at The Drive, are currently listed as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. We would like to note that Ecology and Habitat Studies were submitted as part of the planning application on land to the east of Lavant Road. The report clearly stated that any areas of ecological merit are restricted to the boundaries of the site. In addition, it notes that there isn't evidence of protected species or suitable habitats for these species on this land.</p> <p>The evidence supporting this designation references a Sussex Biodiversity Partnership document. The Sussex Biodiversity Partnership defines Biodiversity Opportunity Areas as areas with the greatest opportunities for habitat creation and restoration, enabling efficient focusing of resources to where they will have the greatest positive conservation impact. The justification in the Neighbourhood Plan notes 55 species within Lavant, including Water Voles and Great Crested Newts. As previously mentioned, protected species are clearly not present in this location and suitable habitats have not been identified.</p> <p>The lack of species and suitable habitats is primarily due to the fact that the fields are ploughed regularly for arable purposes. In addition, there is an absence of connecting habitats due to the lands proximity</p>	<p>Comments noted. Whilst it may be that there is limited ecological value currently the designation is an opportunity area identified by independent experts. The designation seeks to promote habitat creation and restoration as you state and therefore bringing this policy will seek to re-establish flora and fauna across the site.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Lock Family and Ashmarden Ltd contd)	LNDP 14	<p>to existing highways and built form. We are pleased that the plan recognises the potential for development providing any existing habitats are protected or enhanced. However, we would like the above to be noted.</p> <p><i>Views from within The Drive (Policy LDNP 14)</i> This policy lists a number of key views, one of which is located from within land to the east of The Drive, in a northerly direction. Land east of The Drive consists of a relatively flat field, this is ploughed for arable farming purposes. This is private land that is not for public access. There is therefore some confusion as to why a view point has been identified in this location.</p> <p><i>Affordable Housing (Policy LNPD 7)</i> The plan identifies a requirement for all applications consisting of a net increase in dwellings to include a minimum of 50% affordable housing. As the majority of the Parish falls within the National Park, a 50% requirement is not in accordance with the Interim Statement on Planning for Affordable Housing which states that 40% affordable should be provided on sites proposing 10 dwellings or more. It also is important to note that the Chichester Local Plan has recently been adopted, and alongside this, a Community Infrastructure Document for which sums are now being sought throughout the District alongside site specific s106 contributions.</p> <p>The Chichester Local Plan identifies a requirement of 30% affordable housing provision on all net increase of dwellings. The CIL payments have been devised based on this requirement. This therefore means that in the southern area of Lavant Parish, the requirement for 50% affordable provision does not align with the adopted Chichester Local Plan and adopted CIL contributions document. Not only this, but the</p>	<p>LNPD14 This seems to be a misunderstanding from Lock's part of what is meant by a 'view point' whether land is private or not is irrelevant to whether there is a view over it. NAR</p> <p>LNPD agreed to go with CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL policy. OMIT: the first two sentences that refer to circa 30 dwellings and 40% of the land being retained for employment uses. ADD: this site is allocated for an appropriate mixed-use development comprising C3 residential and an element of B1 employment uses. The precise mix is to be determined by a viability assessment agreed between SDNPA and the owner/developer as part of any planning application. The new development should maintain the site's ability to contribute to the wider Chichester economy.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 7	<p>payment of CIL alongside a 50% affordable housing provision may make schemes unnecessarily unviable.</p> <p>We recognise that if schemes are unviable on this basis, then it could be possible to demonstrate this through an open book process. However, this can be a costly and lengthy process for both applicants and the District Council. When the policy in a Neighbourhood Plan does not accord with newly adopted Local Plan policies, this threshold should not be included and the requirement to demonstrate viability should not be necessary.</p> <p>Again, we do recognise the importance of devising a neighbourhood plan and the work and time that has been spent formulating the document to date. We do have concerns that certain policies, such as those outlined above, do not correspond with the newly adopted Chichester Local Plan or the NPPF in respect to boosting the supply of housing and supporting sustainable development wherever possible. Should you wish to discuss the contents of the representations further then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Ellie White MRTPI Land and Planning Manager</p>	
034	28/04/16	Caroline Threadwell Sunley Estates land adjacent to Pook Lane	Q1a Q1b LNDP 4	<p>Yes – it is a very comprehensive document that sets out a clear vision and framework for future development in the Parish</p> <p>Yes – subject to comments attached</p> <p>Land adjacent to Pook Lane (LNDP21) should be amended to a minimum of 20 dwellings</p> <p><i>Additional comments on Pre-Submission (Draft) Document to be read in conjunction with Response Form (submitted on 28th April 2016)</i></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Final dwelling numbers to be determined after discussions between developer and SDNPA.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(Sunley Estates contd)</i>	LNDP 21	<p>LNDP 21 – Land Adjacent to Pook Lane</p> <p>We are writing to you as the developer who has been appointed by the landowners to take this site forward with yourselves. We were delighted that we were chosen out of a great many potential partners in the family who own this land, whose wish it is to ensure that any development will be a fitting legacy to the village and an enhancement for the many generations to come who will live in and around the proposed new homes.</p> <p>We are very pleased to see that the site has been included in the consultation and we are entirely confident that we can <u>deliver a high quality bespoke development</u> that will fulfil the Parish's vision and primary objectives as detailed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>We have read the Rural Housing Needs Survey for the Parish which reflects a demand for a mix of smaller housing, addressing the need for local young people to afford their first home as well as dwellings for the elderly seeking to downsize. As a result we propose a mix of dwelling types and sizes in accordance with policy LNDP 7. We have also discussed the affordable housing provision with Holly Nicol at Chichester District Council who was involved in the preparation of the report and we understand that the South Downs National Park planning authority are now processing 40% affordable housing in their Interim Statement on Planning for Affordable Housing for sites of 10 dwellings or more subject to viability, which we support.</p> <p>We have discussed the site in some depth with both the District Archaeologist and the Local Inspector of ancient Monuments who have both considered the site's suitability for housing. They have both <u>agreed a strategy for the site</u> which strictly adheres to Policy LNDP6 (d) and Policy LNDP17 and incorporates the buffer you have shown on your plan and the new footpath link (identified as (2) on the plan on page 44) in line with Policy LNDP18 and which thereby increases</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p><u>agreed a strategy for the site</u> Comment noted LNDP6:Noted/ NAR</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>pedestrian safety. New signage will inform users about the historic earthworks that exist on the northern boundary of the housing site, whilst we also propose a slight reduction in the development area for the housing area as identified as (1) on the plan on page 44.</p> <p>We note and agree with the many benefits you have identified relating to this site and we have considered the issues that you have raised in the Consultation. We feel that we can both address and minimise the issues with sensitive native landscaping, in accordance with Policy LNDP14 and careful highways design. The site is highly sustainable and we have ample land to provide planting around the site to help the new houses blend in with the surroundings. We build high quality and very attractive dwellings in full compliance with Policy LNDP5 so we would stress that we do not feel we need to hide them away but we do wish to respect the rural nature of the village.</p>	<p>LNDP17:Noted/ NAR LNDP18:Noted/ NAR</p> <p>LNDP14 noted/NAR</p> <p>LNDP5 Noted /NAR, amendments made and policy now reads: <i>"All developments must be of high quality design and respond to and integrate with the local landscape and built environment. In Lavant this means proposals should:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) Reflect the scale, character and historic context of existing buildings in the immediate vicinity.</i> <i>2) Enhance/improve the local character and quality of an area.</i> <i>3) Not deviate from established building lines and arrangements of front gardens, walls, railings or hedges. Where a new boundary treatment is proposed it should reflect</i>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>By being in the fortunate position of being able to simultaneously provide an alternative football pitch (as identified as (4) on the plan on page 44) there will in fact be no loss of amenity space in the village and of course there will be the added significant benefit of the additional parking to the Village Hall (LNDP12) which will provide a valuable amenity for the many users and will help to alleviate the congestion that sometimes occurs, more than negating the small increase in traffic that will occur as a result of the development. We therefore feel that the community benefits are unusually far reaching in this case.</p>	<p><i>other boundary treatments in the immediate vicinity.</i></p> <p>4) <i>Use building and landscaping materials externally that are characteristic of Lavant (primarily brick/flint work walls, timber cladding, timber windows, clay tiled roofs and lead flashings) and are of a quality and life expectancy that match or complement the existing palette</i></p> <p>5) <i>Incorporate the best practice of sustainable design in respect of drainage, low carbon and energy-efficient design.</i></p> <p><i>Incorporate and integrate sufficient external amenity space, refuse and recycling storage and car/cycle parking to ensure a high quality streetscape”</i></p> <p>LNDP12 Noted/NAR</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>During the process of designing the scheme and with the benefit of ecological survey information, we will incorporate improvements to support new and native species as appropriate in accordance with LNDP13.</p> <p>In order to deliver all the community benefits as envisaged in Policy LNDP21 as well as the range of smaller dwellings that the Parish require together with the 40% affordable housing requirement, we would need to deliver as minimum of 20 units on this site. We can provide bungalows on this site which would not only address the clearly demonstrated need in the survey to provide for the elderly less mobile parishioners, but would also be a design feature to respect the wider views to and from the site. There will be a mix of smaller housing to accommodate first time buyers and young families and notably we will still be building at a <u>significantly lower density</u> than that at Meadow Close.</p> <p>We would appreciate the <u>chance to discuss</u> the development opportunities for this site with you at your earliest convenience in order to ultimately deliver the best possible legacy for the village. Yours faithfully Caroline Treadwell, Sunley Estates Ltd.</p>	<p>LNDP13 Noted/NAR</p> <p>Noted</p>
035	19/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>Q2 1.08 p6</p> <p>Q2 1.12 p6</p> <p>Q2 1.18 p10</p>	<p>Yes; and it does so brilliantly. Its authors deserve the thanks of everyone in Lavant.</p> <p>The visionary and environmental elements of the document are particularly well set out.</p> <p>If the vote on the 23 June is for 'Out' of the E.U., the reference to the E.U. in the final sub-section will no longer apply.</p> <p>'pay attention to' sounds governess. Better to read 'have regard to'.</p> <p>Under 'Opportunities' to provide improvements to the River Lavant, add 'and its conservation'.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted, amendment made.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p>Q2 1.18 p10</p> <p>LNDP106.0 4 p28</p> <p>7 p32</p> <p>8.07 p38</p> <p>LNDP26. p51</p>	<p>Under 'threats' the reference to the northern route option for the A27 can now (thankfully) be deleted.</p> <p>I particularly welcome the designation of the land south of St. Mary's Church as a 'Local Green Space'. <u>Environment and sustainability.</u></p> <p>I welcome wholeheartedly this admirably spelt out statement.</p> <p>The car parking on Pook Lane is dangerous. This could be highlighted as a problem.</p> <p>I suggest this should be looked at again. I suspect 8 houses is too many; and access to Pook Lane really is very dangerous.</p>	<p>Comment noted, amendment made.</p> <p>Comment noted, amendment made.</p> <p>LNDP10 comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016</p>
036	22/04/16	R	<p>Q1b</p> <p>Q2 LNDP21 p45</p> <p>Q2 LNDP21 p45</p>	<p>Yes. Thank you to all those involved for all the hard work put in to create those documents. An impressive achievement.</p> <p>Land adjacent Pook Lane 2) A 20m buffer shall will be provided... Delete either 'shall' or 'will' as both not required.</p> <p>Land adjacent to Pook Lane 5) footpaths... A further pedestrian access shall be created linking the south east of the new housing area... Change south east to south west</p>	<p>Comment noted. Amendment made.</p> <p>Comments noted. Final position of any new footpath will be determined as part of any planning application.</p>
037	22/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p>	<p>Yes. It most certainly has. Only hope I'm alive to see (most especially) Ford Water Barns converted into cottages and Ford Water Lane less of a 'Rat Run' as it has now become.</p> <p>Yes. An excellent piece of work by those involved.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
038	22/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b LNDP21 LNDP24 LNDP26 All	Yes. Yes. Concerned as to traffic management when football match is on and crossing the road. Further development of this site should allow the continuing availability of garage and shop. Cannot see that this site is viable as it is owned by the Church. Overall an excellent and well thought-out document. Congratulations to all the Team.	Agreed that there would need to be collateral traffic calming in relation to this proposal. LNDP21 Policy will include bullet point 7 to address this issue. Comment noted. This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016
039	24/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b LNDP8 LNDP9 LNDP21	Yes. It is an Excellent document, the volunteers have done a superb job! Yes. Broadly though I have challenges on 2 policies and one development site. Given the traffic on the A286, I believe, for safety reasons, street lights should be provided with midnight turn-off. Improvement to broadband is urgently required, if local business is to be encouraged. Land adjacent to Pook Lane- see below.	LNDP8 comment noted - is a detail which is covered under justification 5:20. LNDP9 Installation of the required equipment falls within the statutory rights of the utility providers and generally does not require planning permission – therefore will have little / no impact. We therefore did not include 'broadband issues' within LNDP9. Noted/NAR LNDP22 – comment noted.

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP22	A good improvement.	LNDP23 – comment noted.
			LNDP23	A major opportunity to improve the village especially if small business premises are included.	
			LNDP21 contd	<p>Yes, I can be accused of 'nimby' but... cannot support this development on 4 fronts:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is outside the settlement boundary. (LNDP1) 2. It is a greenfield site (LOB 2 and 8). 3. It is special to the community and designated a community space in 'Review of Open Spaces'- ref 6 p14 4. The protection of the Devil's Dyke is a red Herring. It must be protected by the community, regardless! 5. If no trees are to be felled, how is the view to be improved? 6. ... and it nibbles at our critical strategic gap with Chichester. 	<p>LNDP21</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outside settlement boundary. Agreed, as are all the houses to the south of Pook Lane. This area is within the visual boundary of the Settlement 2. Comment noted. 3. Although designated as a Local Community Space. This amenity is entirely due to the present owner's generosity. Development of some of may help to preserve some green areas and provide alternative in perpetuity Community Space. 4. Devils Dyke, would be protected under LNDP21 Bullet point 4. Currently with private land either side, it has been left to degrade over many years. English Heritage and the CDC archaeological officer see an opportunity to improve the monument with an ongoing maintenance plan after restoration. This would include opening up the vistas to the Trundle which are currently not seen from any publicly accessible land. 5. Trees felled to improve views. The few trees on the Dyke will be felled when they come to the end of their natural life. Clearance of the undergrowth is needed to restore the view. The poor quality trees on

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
					<p>the A286 could also be felled to open up a vista.</p> <p>6. Nibbles at Strategic Gap. The strategic gap between Lavant and Chichester starts at Raughmere Drive. During the appeal on the Daffodil Field this was clearly seen as the boundary of the gap.</p>
040	25/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP26</p> <p>LNDP26</p> <p>LNDP26</p> <p>LNDP26</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The document does identify the important aspects of living in East Lavant. However, proposal LNDP26 would not be in keeping with the identified character of the village.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>LNDP26 is not a suitable site for the proposed development of new homes. Please see attached letter dated 24th April 2016</p> <p>Site is too small for Parking requirements of a multiple dwelling development which will lead to overflow parking on Pook Lane. This will worsen current congestion in the village and increase the risk of traffic accidents.</p> <p>Site has no line of sight to East or West due to neighbouring Flint Barn and bridge over the Lavant. Proposed multiple dwelling development will create risk of traffic accidents as residents exit the site.</p> <p>Site has no pavement along the site entrance making entrance/egress dangerous for pedestrians, especially children and the elderly.</p> <p>Multiple dwellings of this kind are not in keeping with the character of the village and would set a precedent for densely packed developments.</p>	<p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
040 contd		(R contd)	<p>LNDP26</p> <p>LNDP26</p> <p>LNDP26</p>	<p>Multiple dwellings would inevitably create significant light pollution. Loss of Lavant's clear dark skies would be detrimental to the village.</p> <p>Proposal does not feature a plan to create an alternative rectory. A key part of the community will be lost if the rectory is removed.</p> <p>We would like to register our objection to the proposed redevelopment of the East Lavant Rectory site (LNDP26 in the Neighbourhood Plan), and would very much appreciate you including our concerns in the review of this proposal. We believe there are a number of factors about this proposal that would be extremely detrimental to the village:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is too small for the parking requirements of a multiple dwelling development. This would inevitably lead to the residents of the new development permanently using Pook Lane as overflow parking. There is already congestion along Pook Lane at peak times due to the volume of traffic now using this route as a 'rat run'. If residents' cars were parked along Pook Lane on a permanent basis this situation will be made worse, and far more dangerous. 2. Establishing multiple dwellings on this site will also create a significant access problem along Pook Lane. The exit from the site has virtually no line of sight to the East due to the neighbouring flint barn, and limited line of sight to the West over the road bridge spanning the Lavant. There is no scope to rectify these issues. Access is challenging enough for one property on the site due to these blindspots and the volume of traffic passing by. The proposal to create multiple dwellings on the site will significantly increase the risk of traffic accidents as residents' vehicles pull out onto Pook Lane. 	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>3. There is no pavement along the site entrance, indicating the site would be unsuitable for regular pedestrian entrance/ egress from multiple dwellings, especially for children and the elderly.</p> <p>4. We also believe that this kind of intense development is not in keeping with the character of the village. This will be densely packed set of dwellings, and there is no precedent for this type of development within the heart of the village. I fear the future consequences of establishing a precedent in East Lavant for single properties being demolished to make way for tightly packed, multiple dwellings. We have read the Neighbourhood Plan proposal in detail, and feel there are far better sites that would significantly benefit from this kind of development, in particular the Eastmead industrial estate (LNDP23 in the Neighbourhood Plan). That is an area that would clearly be enhanced and regenerated by new development.</p> <p>5. Multiple dwellings on this site will inevitable significantly increase the level of light pollution in an area known for the clarity of its dark night skies. This would be a great loss to the village.</p> <p>6. Finally, the proposal does not feature a plan to create an alternative Rectory in the village. We believe a key part of the community will be lost if a Rectory is removed from the East Lavant.</p> <p>Please let us know if you require any further information from us regarding the above. We shall be in attendance at the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting at St Mary's on Monday 9th may, and we look forward to meeting you there.</p> <p>Paul and Julie Hopes</p>	
041	26/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b	Yes.	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>No. I disagree with the way that the East Lavant settlement area excludes the traditional nucleus of the village: rectory, church, Church Farm, Manor Farm.</p> <p>LNDP-2016-32 <u>East Lavant Settlement Area</u></p> <p>The Draft Plan proposes a new Settlement Area for East Lavant. Everything outside this area is to be deemed 'countryside'. To draw the boundaries of the Settlement Area, the Steering Group has applied the SDNPA methodology, property by property.</p> <p>We believe that this approach has failed to define a Settlement Area which is consistent with the history of the village. Indeed, the proposed boundary has- remarkably- almost completely excluded the historic centre of the village. The Group has published an old map on page 2 of its Review of Heritage Assets in Lavant. This gives a much better idea of where the heart of the historic village lies than the proposed Settlement area does.</p> <p>Historically, East Lavant is a traditional nuclear village, initially located near the river crossing, and based around the Church, the rectories (old and new), the old school, Church Farm and Manor Farm. The Group has identified a number of other heritage assets also located in this part of the village.</p> <p>It cannot be right that the proposed Settlement Area almost completely excludes the traditional centre of the village - thereby classifying it, rather strangely, as countryside.</p> <p>Further, the SDNPA rules have been applied to properties by rote so that there are large parts of East Lavant, especially in the southern and western parts of the village which are deemed to be countryside even</p>	<p>We note this request to redraw the settlement boundary of East Lavant to incorporate the Church, the new rectory, Church Farm and the buildings of the former Manor Farm.</p> <p>The SG have adopted the published Settlement Boundary Review methodology by SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY in undertaking this review and having looked at buildings requested are content that the areas requested should remain outside of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>As a result the requested area has not been incorporated into the settlement boundary.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>though they are surrounded by historic buildings which form part of the traditional core of the village. The area east of Fordwater Road and north-west of Lower Road is one such example. It also seems odd that houses on one side of the road can be “in” while those on the other side are “out”.</p> <p>As guided by the SDNPA methodology, the group has lopped off the end of some gardens (but not all) at 10 metres to tighten the grip of the Settlement Area. This has doubtless been done as part of a well-intentioned desire to curtail in-fill development.</p> <p>But overall, this has achieved an unfortunate distortion in the character and definition of what East Lavant is –and even where it is. Although the village has become, sadly, more suburbanised in the half century my family has lived here, one of the attractions of East Lavant is the large amount of open space in the heart of the village. But not all open space is countryside.</p> <p>We believe that the Settlement Area should be redrawn to incorporate the traditional core of the village. Specifically, it should include the Church, the new rectory, Church Farm and the buildings of the former Manor Farm, which now form a substantial cluster of dwellings which are not physically detached from the village and which cannot in any way be described as “countryside”.</p> <p>LNDP-2016-32 <u>Site 12. Land East of St Roche’s Close</u></p> <p>a. In February 2015 we attended a meeting with representatives from the Steering Group (“the Group”) to discuss Site 12. We were told that the Group was assessing what the village wanted in terms of housing and other amenities. We agreed that we would be</p>	<p>The LPC regrets the unfortunate misunderstanding that arose. The land put forward has now been assessed.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>interested to hear the outcome and would then see what we could do to satisfy the village's requirements.</p> <p>b. We explained that our own preference was for small scale, high quality development of 10-12 houses, with perhaps 50% affordable housing, at the southern end of the site, where access is good, there is no significant flood risk and the houses would nestle into the landscape very well, softening the existing hard, unnatural line of the railway.</p> <p>c. However, despite prompting, we didn't hear anything back from the Steering Group.</p> <p>d. Separately the SDNPA made a request for submissions of major sites which could be made available so that it could carry out a wider assessment of site availability. We submitted Site 12 to the SDNPA in October 2015 with an illustrative layout prepared by Nash and Partners, to give an idea what could be built there should the SDNPA require it. Our submission also examined in detail the site's flood risk, taking into account the recent reports carried out for WSCC by Capita Symons. These reports showed that, while the north-eastern section part of the site was vulnerable to flooding (both fluvial and groundwater), the southern and western parts were not. Our experience of the site bears out their conclusion.</p> <p>e. Out of courtesy we copied our SDNPA submission to the Steering Group. Unfortunately the Group interpreted this as meaning that we wanted to build a huge extension to Lavant Down. The draft Document twice states that "the owner's agent has expressed a clear intention to develop this site" but this is not true. As a result, the Draft Document contains the Group's assessment of a "proposed development for 129 dwellings". But please be clear: we are not supporting this.</p> <p>f. Unfortunately, the Group's assessment of the site makes no reference to any of the more up-to-date and reliable information about flood risk prepared for WSCC. Instead, it relies on the</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>notoriously inaccurate EA flood risk zone maps. As a consequence, we believe that the maps used in assessing the flood risk to the southern part of this site are far too broad brush and unreliable and the assessment should be re-done.</p> <p>g. Technically we are still waiting, as agreed, for the Group to tell us what it believes the village wants. We last heard from the Group in July 2015 when, after prompting, we were emailed "We haven't forgotten you! We having been making progress with the SAE assessments we have to do on each site and will get back to you as soon as we can." But this didn't happen and the Group has now produced its Draft Document with an assessment of a proposal which we didn't propose.</p> <p>h. Therefore, in the absence of any information about what the Group wants from us, we should be very grateful if the group would please now assess what we do propose, namely the type of attractive, small-scale, mixed tenure development in the southern part of the site described in paragraph b.</p>	
042	27/04/16	R		<p>Dear Ms Whitaker</p> <p>Having read the Neighbourhood Plan relating to the proposed development of the East Lavant Rectory site, I would like to comment before the meeting on May 9th.</p> <p>I agree that the Rectory is not a building of particular note and I do not have a problem with the site being altered but I do have a huge concern with the number of dwellings proposed.</p> <p>I feel a maximum of 3 or, possibly, 4 houses would fit onto the site: 8 houses would be rabbit hutches (similar to those of the Greylingwell site) with little garden space. Sadly, I have a cynical feeling that 8 houses would see the builder going beyond the existing site boundary</p>	<p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>unless a very strict control is kept. Developers/builders are very devious individuals! I also think the building materials should reflect those of the local area.</p> <p>I am also cynical about the word affordable and feel that there should be a covenant which only allows local Lavant people to buy the properties.</p> <p>I do wonder what will happen to the Rectory if the current Rectory is demolished. Lavant is a big parish which can sustain a rector rather than being joined with another parish. Perhaps the C of E has a plan for another Rectory.</p> <p>The entrance/exit to the current Rectory is one of take your life in your own hands as you pull out. The increased volume of traffic would cause concern and accessibility issues would need to be addressed which could detract from this pretty corner of the village with its bridge onto the village green area. The bridge itself is rather narrow.</p> <p>There are issues regarding development without the <u>East Lavant Settlement Boundary</u> and within the South Downs National Park. Building, on this scale, makes a mockery of area protection safeguards.</p> <p>I happen to live on Pook Lane but the proposed houses will make no difference to my outlook so I am not objecting for personal or NIMBY reasons. We have had developments in the Lavant area in recent years which have blended in well and people do need houses.</p> <p>I am just very concerned about 8 houses being squeezed onto a site that is just too small. Living cheek by jowl in a box will not be pleasant for the occupants.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				I would like to take this opportunity to thank you, and your fellow councillors, for all the work which you carry out so well on behalf of our village.	
043	27/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP21 p44/45</p> <p>LNDP23 p47</p> <p>LNDP25 p50</p> <p>LNDP26 p51</p> <p>LNDP11 p30 6.07</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>a-Would area 4 include Club House facilities and some space for parking.</p> <p>b-Redevelopment of this site can only encourage use of industrial units. A shop at the entrance would attract passing trade whilst providing a service to new/local housing area. Cycle/ pedestrian entrance to Centurion way would encourage trade too. Insufficient parking would be an issue to Gaston Way which suffers a great deal now. Issues also for Lavant down. Could be a part of improvement for local sewerage infrastructure?!</p> <p>c- Extra parking would impact on local residents, it need to be a safe community space. Servicing a community shop-cause same problem. Boundary planting? A managed wild meadow planting would enhance the tranquillity of the area.</p> <p>d-Curio-flooding? Could a safer access to this site be achieved from the rear onto the Ford Water Road?</p> <p>e-To be included... The grass area adjacent to the A286, from St. Nicholas Road entrance up to the Church. As soon as the children cross the busy A286 they are free and safe to run across this area.</p>	<p>LNDP21 The proposal is that only the football pitch would be relocated – facilities would remain within the Memorial Hall.</p> <p>LNDP23 Comments noted as useful and important. Issues highlighted are part of ongoing detailed discussions.</p> <p>LNDP25 – This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p> <p>LNDP26 This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016</p> <p>LNDP11 The grass area adjacent to the A286, from St. Nicholas Road.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p>LNDP14 p34 7.09</p> <p>LNDP18 p38 8.05</p> <p>LNDP14 7.09 p34</p>	<p>f-Pine trees are rapidly growing and will soon obscure "Blake's View" from The Earl of March.</p> <p>g-Great idea for footpath from Churchmead alongside the Lavant. The bridge at a height to allow Duck Race helpers to pass, please!!</p> <p>h-Key view. The length of the A286 from Greens Barn to the North of the village. The view across to Kingley Vale.</p>	<p>Assessed and will now be included as a Local Community Space in the Submission Plan. Comments noted.</p> <p>LNDP18 Comment noted.</p> <p>View suggested was considered by the SG. This view is covered in the main by other key views of Kingley Vale, and high banking and hedging obscures other aspects.</p>
044	27/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP22 p46</p> <p>LNDP21 p44</p> <p>LNDP26 p51</p> <p>LNDP25 p50</p>	<p>Yes. The village must consider- school places, doctors' surgery, all sewerage/drainage.</p> <p>Yes. The Committee should be congratulated on the document produced by a lot of hard work! Thank You!</p> <p>Church Farm Barns: entrance onto Fordwater Road- on left, huge tree and narrow- to the right road in vary bad condition. Proposed 'Footpath'- must not reduce width of road.</p> <p>Land adjacent to Pook Lane. (New football pitch) "ROAD SAFETY"- crossing from pitch over to village hall?</p> <p>"The Rectory"- a new Rectory could be built on the plot at the junction of Lower Road and Fordwater Road??!</p> <p>St. Nicholas Church - will there be 'any' religious services held at St Nicholas??</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues would be covered at detailed planning stage.</p> <p>Comments noted - LNDP21 Agreed that there would need to be collateral traffic calming in relation to this proposal and this constraint will be included as bullet point no 7 of the Policy .LNDP21.</p> <p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
					This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016
045	27/04/16	R	<p>Q1a Q1b Q2 LNDP14 p34</p> <p>LNDP23</p> <p>LNDP25</p>	<p>Yes. Yes. Length of the 286 from the greens barn to 7.09 the north of the village looking west to Kingley Vale.</p> <p>Very concerned about parking in Gaston Way already have a lot of people from Yarbrook parking on grass ect and questioning benefit of direct access to public footpath ect.</p> <p>Should not lose green space by St Nics impact of local residents of off road parking.</p>	<p>View suggested was considered by the SG. This view is covered in the main by other key views of Kingley Vale, and high banking and hedging obscures other aspects.</p> <p>Comments noted as useful and important. Issues highlighted are part of ongoing detailed discussions. Master plan needs to strive to help offer some relief on this important local issue.</p> <p>LNDP25 This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p>
046	27/04/16	R	<p>Q1a Q1b</p> <p>LNDP20</p>	<p>Yes. No. See comments of LNDP20</p> <p><u>Effective Traffic Management</u> This policy in no way addresses the problems caused by the volume and speed of through traffic on the A286. The only way that the current situation can be satisfactorily improved is with the construction of a western bypass, which until recently was an approved West Sussex County Council scheme. I don't believe that enough thought has been given to how the quality of people's lives would be improved by the removal of through traffic from the village. I accept that a bypass is unlikely to be built in the near future but the route should at least be included in the LNDP and protected as an</p>	<p>Comments noted. This suggestion is already recorded in Consultation Document and Community Matters.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				option for the future and not be dismissed out of hand. Lavant Parish Council should be actively promoting the construction of a bypass which would improve the lives of a great many residents of Lavant.	
047	27/04/16	R	<p>Q2 4.14 p20</p> <p>Q2 6.04 p28</p> <p>Q2 7.20 p36. 2b</p> <p>Q2 7.20 p36. 2g</p>	<p>Gives the impression the whole area is used informally by dog walkers - should only refer to the footpaths.</p> <p>Should Read- The WWII Memorial at the junction of Pook Lane with Sheepwash Lane.</p> <p>Description confusing - do you mean Marsh Lane?</p> <p>Check date of Village Hall - 1920</p>	<p>Comments noted, but no change made.</p> <p><u>The WWII Memorial</u>. Comment noted and wording changed to "<i>The WWII Memorial at the junction of Pook Lane with Sheepwash Lane</i>"</p> <p>Comment noted and change made.</p> <p>Checked.</p>
048	28/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP10</p> <p>LNDP11</p> <p>LNDP14</p> <p>LNDP15</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>We particularly welcome the inclusion of the allotments as designated local green space and the fact that the Plan recognises the importance of them to the local community.</p> <p>We support the retention of local community spaces listed as these are the key in maintaining the open spaces which enhance the character of these parts of the village and avoid other development.</p> <p>We support the key views listed as these are fundamental in retaining the special landscape character of Lavant. .</p> <p>We support the policy to allocate functional floodplan to assist in managing flood events and avoid development in this area.</p>	<p>LNDP10 Comment noted.</p> <p>LNDP11 Comment noted.</p> <p>LNDP14 Comment noted.</p> <p>LNDP15 Comment noted.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p>LNDP17</p> <p>LNDP21-26</p> <p>LNDP3</p>	<p>We support conservation of the assets listed to preserve and protect these for the future.</p> <p>We broadly support the dwelling allocations and locations suggested and the proposal for a community Hub at St Nicholas. Although it is unclear how parking would be managed at the community Hub.</p> <p>We support the retention of the local gaps listed to maintain the separate character and identity of the different parts of the village.</p> <p>Finally a big thank you to the Steering Group for all your hard work. You've produced a fantastic, comprehensive well produced plan, we think you've done a great job.</p>	<p>LNDP17 Comment noted.</p> <p>LNDP21-26 Comment noted.</p> <p>LNDP25 – This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p> <p>LNDP3. Comment noted.</p>
049	28/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP 21</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>I have the following concerns about this site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The replacement football field could be very wet in the winter. This year with a high water table the village green pitch was very soft and sometimes unplayable, whilst the top pitch drains very much better. The proposed site for the new pitch is likely to give the same performance as the village green pitch therefore in a wet winter football may not be playable in Lavant. The only solution would be to raise the site of the pitch and have good drainage 2. The proposed houses are likely to be very visible if and when the excess vegetation on the Devil's Ditch is removed to protect the monument. 	<p>1 Although the proposed new site is at a higher elevation than the village green it would have to be carefully surveyed prior to the design and construction to ensure that it does not suffer from the same problems as the village green location</p> <p>2 The houses are unlikely to be as visible as those already fronting the A286 to the north of Devils Dyke. They will be tucked into the SW corner of the site</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
					beyond the entrenchment. It might be possible to see the roofs but this in itself will be covered by LNDP5 (High Quality Design) which aims to ensure an appropriate choice of materials
050	28/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b Q2 Map 4/18 POLICY NO LNDP3	Yes. Yes. (Key Omissions/inaccuracies) The field immediately to the S. East of the primary school is only partially shown as lying within the local gap. The demarcation line is marked as the track of the Roman Road which is not a visible feature on the ground. We assume that this is a mistake in the production of the map which should be corrected (ie whole field to be shown as local gap) before final submission. As described on Page 20 4.14	Comment noted. Area of land has been reviewed in the context of other Sites and Village views. The strategic gap will be extended up to south corner of Lavant Primary School plot to the bridge over Centurion Way. The area currently excluded will be redefined as the SW portion fulfils criteria 2 and 5 for local gap. (see Open Spaces Evidence Bank)The NE portion doesn't meet the criteria. Map Extract 1 will be amended to include area behind school.
051	28/04/16	Derek Kingaby LR4RR	Q1a Q1b LNDP 4 LNDP 21	No Fails to adequately address the adverse impact of the volume and nature of traffic through Mid-Lavant on A286. Traffic was perhaps the major concern raised by the public No Fails to plan for medium to long term future. Fails to recognise the potential for improvement of the environment and scope for provision of a wide range of community facilities. Football pitch should be retained. Wrong location for housing.	Football Pitch. This is at the generosity of the owner with no future certainty. A like for like replacement pitch has formed part of the

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 23	Loss of important through views to the Trundle – view should be included as a key view Policy LNDP 14	evaluation by the owner and is included as under the Policy. Bullet point 8 of LNDP21
			LNDP 19	Industrial Estate should be retained in its entirety. Employment potential should be maximised. Squeezing in further housing into North Side unacceptable.	View across to Trundle from A286 is obscured by vegetation.
			LNDP 19	Parking standards impracticable e.g. 4 bedroom house – 5 on-site parking spaces?	Comment noted. Mix of residential and employment use to be finalised as part of ongoing discussions between the developer and SDNPA.
			LNDP 20	Traffic calming proposal will achieve very little. Fail to address volume and nature of A286 traffic and highway configuration.	Comments noted. SG consider that the policies relating to LNDP19 are justified within the Plan for the reasons set out in the Plan and supporting Evidence Base. They are not contrary to Policies within the Development Plan. Instead they build upon them to provide more clarity regarding local requirements within the Parish.
			LNDP 21	Replacement football pitch will be intrusive in open countryside, poorly drained and exposed to wind	Comments noted. LNDPs cannot address these issues.
			Community Matters p8 - 9	Reference to the proposed Relief Road. At the request of the Steering Group evidence supporting the case for the RR was submitted. The evidence demonstrated the need (traffic volumes), cost and means of funding and the wide range of community benefits. The evidence and the proposed draft proposal and safeguarding policy should be included along with the accompanying reasoned justification. Inclusion	Opinion noted/ changes made to Policy wording.
					<u>Community Matters pg.-9</u> . The SG and the Parish Council deem the inclusion of the RR under 'Community Matters' as wholly appropriate. Mr Kingaby recognises that the RR is not currently deliverable. At any point in

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>in the documentation is important, not only to reflect representations received reflecting strongly held views of a large number of Lavant residents, but to ensure that the case in favour of the RR can be revisited in the future if opinion should change.</p> <p>A large number of residents favoured the RR. Their views have been dismissed and the case in favour "buried". The failure to include the evidence in support of the RR as part of the Pre Submission Public Consultation, even with reasons for its rejection, denied the public an opportunity to consider the RR as a longer term possibility. No vision for the future!</p>	<p>time, should the RR become deliverable, and or the concept receive sufficient community support, then the community are free to pursue the concept, either within the life of the current LNDP or as part of a future LNDP. Noted NAR Consultation Statement 2.111-115 includes a full record of this issue Appendix Document 14a-e .</p>
052	28/04/16		R	<p>Response and comment on the draft Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>The village of Lavant has three distinct components bound loosely together by open space. Any development proposals must respect and maintain this characteristic so as to avoid the risk of creating a large homogenous suburb.</p> <p>Large scale developments tend to create an environment with its own characteristic and not forming part of the wider parish. Such proposals when they arise should be resisted.</p> <p>The proposal to develop the present football field at the western end of Pook Lane and the junction of the A286 and bounded on its northern side by the Devils Dyke runs the risk of filling in what should be <u>an open vista and space</u> separating the linear strip of mid-Lavant from East Lavant at the bottom of Pook Lane starting at the Memorial Hall. Development on this site is regretted and cannot be supported in this submission. However, if this objection is dismissed it should be made clear by means of legally binding agreements that development</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Views from the Toll House and separation of mid to East Lavant. <i>The historic views from the Toll House are no longer available as the trees have been allowed to grow and block that view. Whilst there will be a need to take out the poorer of the species along the A286 this will not in itself open up views from the Toll House.</i></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>must preserve the clear unobstructed view across the site from a standpoint near the Toll cottages and looking towards Goodwood to the north-east. New buildings should not encroach on this cone of vision and should be severely restricted in height and bulk.</p> <p>The proposal for housing development on the site of the present rectory is reasonable but should be low rise and developed in a way that creates a visual cluster rather than an inward looking cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Considerable work has gone into the preparation of this Neighbourhood Development Plan and the authors are to be congratulated on their efforts. However, it is suggested that some opportunities have been lost due possibly because it was thought that suitable land would not be forthcoming during the plan period. It is submitted that suitable sites that would meet village requirements should be included even if at the moment they are not available due to the reluctance of freeholders to consider disposing of their land or making access across it for development purposes.</p> <p>Geoffrey Claridge 5 The Close Lavant</p>	<p><i>The entrenchment of Devils Dyke has also been allowed to grow in an uncontrolled manner which also prevents the views to the Trundle. The proposal includes a new public access along the entrenchments thus re-opening the views, albeit from a closer viewpoint than the Toll House.</i></p> <p>This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016</p>
053	28/04/16	R	Q1a	Yes	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			Q1b Q2	Yes (Key omissions or inaccuracies) ALL TYPOS – ON SEPARATE ATTACHMENT	
054	28/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b LNDP 26	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Apart from following comments:</p> <p>I am writing to object to Spatial Strategy LNDP 26 which relates to the allocation of the Rectory for up to eight affordable dwellings. The existing rectory is located outside the built up area of East Lavant and does not currently abut any of its boundaries. It is therefore in the countryside both in planning policy terms and having regard to pattern of development and character of the locality. It is also located within the South Downs National Park, the Conservation Area and adjacent to the proposed local gap (Policy LNDP 3). I am therefore of the opinion that an increase in the density of development on this site would significantly affect the existing spacious character in this part of the village and be harmful to the National Park, Conservation Area and setting of the local gap. Furthermore, the form of development, which would be likely to extend deep into the site would be uncharacteristic of development along Pook Lane which comprises largely frontage development.</p> <p>I am also concerned that there are a number of other constraints on the site, the effects of which are unknown at the present time. It is stated that the site is located within Flood Zone 2 and may require mitigation measures to be incorporated into any development which could result in floor levels being raised. This would obviously result in any dwellings on the site to be more visible in the landscape.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are trees on the site which are of significance and contribute to the landscape setting of the Conservation Area. These trees along with the flint/brick boundary wall and flint curio which has</p>	This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>been identified at the rear of the site could pose significant constraints on the development of the site. Without further investigation into these issues the number of dwellings that the site can accommodate may not be achievable or viable.</p> <p>The only access to the site is via the existing access and I am concerned that visibility is extremely restricted in an easterly direction by the existing building on the road frontage. There is therefore no opportunity to make improvements within the site. Any intensification of residential use on the site is therefore likely to compromise highway safety as a result of addition movements in and out of a substandard access . Whilst the site assessment comments that the road could be realigned, without any further detail, this could have detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area or the footpath on the north side of the lane.</p> <p>Whilst I fully support the principle of providing affordable homes in the Parish, I do not think this is the right site to provide for it. I note that the South Downs National Park Authority's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment rejected a number of other sites better related to the existing built up area of East Lavant on the basis that their development would have a potential adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape. Those sites were identified as being highly sensitive due to their edge of settlement location. This site, being located away from the settlement boundary should be considered equally sensitive and unsuitable for development due to the potential adverse impacts I have identified.</p> <p>On a final note, I am also concerned that no provision has been made for an alternative Rectory in the village and its loss would be detrimental to the wider community.</p>	

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				I trust you will have regard to my comments at the forthcoming meeting to consider the responses to the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan.	
055	28/04/16	David Kent Football Club	Q1a Q1b LNDP 21	Yes As far as the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan is concerned. However our football club has greater interest in the Community Matters Document, which falls outside of the scope particularly Community Wellbeing projects identified. Yes The football club support the ideas and policies of the Pre-submission (Draft Document), with particular focus/comment on LNDP 21 Land adjacent to Pook Lane. As long as the football pitch is reprovided for in the location adjacent to the village hall to a good standard for football sports activities and it incorporates provision for youth activities as well where possible. See Support Pre-submission Document.	Comment noted. Provision for like-for-like pitch included in policy LNPD21. Bullet point 8
056	28/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b LNDP 23 LNDP 21	It is a well thought out and much considered document with a technical content. Yes, overall, but with comments below Redevelopment is required and a mix of industrial starter units and residential to be preferred. The view of the village from the Downs will be enhanced This site is sensitive. It is on the Gateway to SDNP and is currently a village amenity.	LNPD23 Comment noted. LNPD21 – <i>amenity</i> . This is at the generosity of the owner with no future certainty. The intent of the Policy is to obtain use of part of the land by

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p>LNDP 8</p> <p>LNDP 8</p> <p>LNDP3</p>	<p>The provision of an alternative football pitch location has <u>not</u> been evaluated and costed.</p> <p>The provision of a car park is across the busy Pook Lane.</p> <p>The dark sky policy is compromised as currently there is nothing. A development provides light.</p> <p>The Devil's Dyke is an important historic landmark, visible from both the Downs and the SDNP gateway and would be compromised with development of this site .</p>	<p>the public in perpetuity. Bullet pt nos 4, 5 , 8 . of LNDP21</p> <p><i>provision of an alternative football pitch</i> like for like pitch has formed part of the evaluation by the owner. Bullet point 8 of LNDP21</p> <p><i>the busy Pook Lane</i> The crossing to the Memorial Hall parking is proposed via a raised platform (speed table) to improve the control of the traffic in Pook Lane. Bullet point 7 of LNDP21</p> <p>LNDP8 – Comment noted. Impact of developments are referred to in the policy.</p> <p>LNDP3: Devil's Dyke is protected under National Heritage at Risk Register and any development must take this into consideration.</p>
057	28/04/15	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP 21</p> <p>Q3</p> <p>LNDP3</p>	<p>Yes. A little more emphasis could have been placed on the arable and pasture land.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Although supportive in general the impact on road traffic particularly to the south of the site - will need to be considered. I am also concerned that more protection will be needed for Devil's Ditch.</p> <p>(Comments relating to other supporting docs)</p> <p>The accompanying map</p> <p>I would like to see the blue hatching indicating a local gap extended to include the whole of the field south of Lavant C of E Primary School. Currently it goes to the marked site of the Roman Road (although its</p>	<p>LNDP21 – comments noted.</p> <p>Devil's Dyke is protected under National Heritage at Risk Register and any development must take this into consideration. LNDP21 Policy includes Bullet point 4 to protect Devil's Dyke</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP8	precise course can be disputed). The field is "countryside" and with the SDNP and outside the settlement boundary. Any structures created in what I believe is West Lavant Field could have a significant detrimental visual impact for those looking from the north, west and east as well as affecting the "dark sky".	LNDP3: area of land has been reviewed in the context of other Sites and Village views. The strategic gap will be extended up to south corner of Lavant Primary School plot to the bridge over Centurion Way. The area currently excluded will be redefined as the SW portion fulfils criteria 2 and 5 for local gap. (see Open Spaces Evidence Bank). The NE portion doesn't meet the criteria. Map Extract 1 will be amended to include area behind school. LNDP8 – comment noted.
058	28/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b LNDP 18 8.05 LNDP 19 LNDP 11 LNDP 25	Yes Yes I strongly support connectivity between Mid and East Lavant with footpath across river to avoid A286 Useful guidelines for <u>new</u> developments. Inadequate provision for parking on St Nicholas Road and Springfield Close means cars parked dangerously obstructing traffic flow and causing accidents. Recommend widening by partial removal of bank. Local community space – triangle of grass behind bus stop to be extended as far as St Nic's	Comment noted. LNDP19 Comment noted. Beyond scope of the LNDP ref LPC. LNDP11 This particular space has been assessed (See evidence base document <i>A Review Of Open Spaces In And Around Lavant</i>). Currently this space is proposed to be allocated as a Local Community Space (LNDP11). LNDP25 This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 23 LNDP 10 6.04	This triangle of grass may be needed for parking if shop set up in St Nic's. Pedestrian crossing too. Local shop – YES! Eastmead is priority ever since new sites as needs redevelopment – housing and community space – youth club, medical centre, shop. Central and pedestrian access Field adjoining children's play area at end of Churchmead Close is in disputed ownership. Acquisition by community as orchard?	LNDP23 – comments noted. LNDP10 Good idea include in Community Matters.
059	28/04/16	R	Q1a Q1b Page 18 LNDP3	Yes Area south of Lavant CP school is incorrectly annotated as Lavant CE Primary School whereas this is open farmland and should be included in the hatching for local gap along with rest of this field.	Page 18: Agreed labelling of Map to be altered LNDP3: area of land has been reviewed in the context of other Sites and Village views. The strategic gap will be extended up to south corner of Lavant Primary School plot to the bridge over Centurion Way. The area currently excluded will be redefined as the SW portion fulfils criteria 2 and 5 for local gap. (see Open Spaces Evidence Bank). The NE portion doesn't meet the criteria. Map Extract 1 will be amended to include area behind school.
060	28/04/16	R	Site 14	Proposal to redevelop Rectory site. I have read the Pre-Submission (draft) document, but feel that the above proposal should be strongly opposed for three reasons: 1. The newly appointed Rector, wife and two children are expected to take up residence by mid-summer 2016, and it is so important that they be located in close proximity to the adjacent St Mary's Church, which is an essential hub of Lavant village life.	This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>2. A substantial number of very large inter-continental lorries, also large domestic tractors, have difficulty crossing the adjacent bridge and negotiating the acute turn into and out of the narrow lane leading northwards to the very large farm and associated well-developed processing plant. (There is also equestrian use.)</p> <p>3. The large number of vehicles heading westwards into Pook Lane from Fordwater Road would have very poor visibility of pedestrians, cyclists and motor traffic, regardless of any speed-limit which might be imposed.</p>	
061	28/04/16	R	<p>Q1a</p> <p>Q1b</p>	<p>Yes We particularly like the plans for “small-scale” pockets of housing areas, so not to have one large estate.</p> <p>Yes I suspect a lot of consideration and negotiating went into the document – well done. I/We are somewhat surprised that there were no plans to build homes S and E of primary school, close to school and on a site that had tree cover, so as to avoid spoiling the views from the SDNP. Perhaps you were mindful of a future N-S bypass route! To put our minds at rest could someone contact us to explain the reasoning behind the decision (s). Well done to you all.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Road developments are not part of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. In addition, neither WSCC nor SDNPA in any way support a N-S bypass. Ref meeting 31 July 2015.</p>
062	28/04/16	R	Q1a	<p>Yes Mainly, but it now needs to be more related to the SDNP and reflect those needs better. a-This is identified in Para 1.10 but is not taken into account properly in LNDP 4 in particular. -Also, the <u>key views in LNDP 14 should include the view across the south floodplain area, particularly where looking up to the NP from the South across from paths.</u></p>	<p>LNDP14 View referred to is from path on S side of Pook Lane down past Rawmere House towards The Drive . Agreed view particularly</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>R contd)</i>	<p>Q1b</p> <p>LNDP 4.17</p> <p>LNDP 18</p>	<p>c-The football playing field (within LNDP 21) should be a Local Green Space as with the cricket pitch.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>I support most of the policies, but have not properly looked at LNDP 22-26. However, in particular I object to:</p> <p>LNDP 4. 75 new homes is too many - why plan to increase the Village's home numbers by 10% (while ignoring other applications) in only 15 years and exceed SDNP's 2015 recommendations by almost 300%?</p> <p>LNDP 21 - Conflicts with LNDP 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, & 17. Your plan MUST not conflict with its policies. Also, it will provide very dangerous precedents for other applications in the future.</p> <p>The near-by new and planned construction of housing in Chichester means it is not "essential" to do so in Lavant, particularly as the SDNP is different. This section 4.17 is wrong</p> <p>New Rights of Way would be good but are not THE reason to support a development proposal (as indicated), just a beneficial factor.</p>	<p>looking across Floodplain up to the Trundle is 'key' Add to list and Map</p> <p>a- LNDP4. SDNPA 20 is an allocation that is not based on Lavant Housing need. As there was no identified requirement we were encouraged at the outset to carry out a Housing Needs Survey and this identified the numbers used in the plan. 75 is our target based on that survey to provide a mix of houses and is somewhat lower than the new dwellings build over the past 15 years.</p> <p>2 LNDP4.4.17 Comment has been noted. Agreed that plan must not conflict with policies and we hope that the Submission document deals with this conflict.</p> <p>3 The intention of the new housing is to satisfy the need to house the more elderly and younger generations of Lavant residents for whom housing is generally unaffordable/unavailable. It is the type of housing that is critical. SDNPA 20 is an allocation not based on Lavant Housing need</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
					<p>LNDP18 Review by SG of Policy wording <i>Amend to Within the Plan Area, existing public rights of way and means of public access will be protected and where possible enhanced. In the event that a public right of way crosses a proposed development site, the proposal will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that either the current course of the right of way can be retained or that any diversion would not result in any adverse impact on this public amenity or safety of the general public. Developments are encouraged to provide new public rights of way along the routes identified on the LNDP Map</i></p>
			LNDP 21 P44	New developments should be on brown sites where possible as said in LOB2 - I can't see this stated in a LNDP policy?	Comment noted . Brownfield site reference added as Bullet point LNDP 6
			LNDP 21 West	Your map pleasingly shows greenery throughout but, as you say, access by the west road entrance will need trees removed and developers/homeowners will clear southern hedges/screens. Your map thus doesn't show how it will appear.	LNDP21 p44 The trees along the A286 are generally in poor condition. There will be a requirement to retain the trees that are good specimens which means that the access can be planned in the gaps. There is a requirement to retain the trees along Pook Lane.
			LNDP 21 East	This site is greenfield (not brownfield), is outside any settlement boundary, will be detrimental to the village landscape when approaching the SDNP gateway, doesn't conserve SDNP characteristics and your development plan won't reflect	LNDP West. The site is adjacent to the Settlement Boundary and not remote from it (as are the houses to the south of Pook Lane). Thus the site is within the boundary of the

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p>SA p15 5.13</p> <p>SA p15 5.15</p> <p>SA p15 5.19</p>	<p>the local density or have a complementary scale. Therefore it fails to meet MANY of your policies and so should be rejected.</p> <p>A football pitch here on the floodplain will need substantial levelling and new surrounding hedges etc. It will therefore seriously damage the appearance of the floodplain and views up and across from neighbouring roads and paths. This plan fails aspects in LNDP 1, 2, 3, 14 and 17. (re 17, you should be aware that the Scheduled Ancient Monument runs along the west side of the proposed football pitch where levelling will be needed).</p> <p>Also, crossing Pook Lane for young footballers will be dangerous so future changes to the layout may be needed with southside parking etc</p> <p>This is the wrong place for a football pitch so this plan should be rejected too.</p> <p>A2 should only consider adding brownfield sites outside settlement areas. Otherwise, the village will lose its shape over time, which is inappropriate within the SDNP</p> <p>B2 should only apply to brownfield sites.</p> <p>You should opt for Option D1. D2 is way too big a difference.</p>	<p>settlement albeit not within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The policies require that any development is of an appropriate scale and density. (LNDP6)</p> <p>LNDP East. The proposed new site for a like for like (not full size) pitch can be accommodated on the east side of the field away from the entrenchment. And is included as bullet point 8 of LNDP21 .The CDC archaeological officer was keen that no levelling took place adjacent to the entrenchment.</p> <p>The Submission proposal includes for a platform within Pook Lane (LNDP21Bullet point7) to act both as a traffic calming measure and to facilitate safe crossing. There is no proposal to park south of Pook Lane. It is accepted that not all development can occur within the existing built envelope – it is considered that the options considered are realistic and sensible.</p> <p>Noted – comment as above.</p> <p>Noted – The SG considered B1 this but on the evidence available chose to go with option D2.</p>
063	28/04/16	R	Q1a	<p>No</p> <p>Insufficient weight has been given to Lavant’s position at the gateway to the National Park and the two planning authority’s figures for lower housing requirements in this context. <u>The housing target has been set</u></p>	<p><u>The housing target has been set too high and should be lowered and reflect the South</u></p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(R contd)		<p><u>too high</u> and should be lowered and reflect the South Downs Local Plan Preferred Options (20 dwellings), as it is incompatible with other objectives and policies at national, regional and local level.</p> <p>Q1b Whilst I support many of the ideas and policies therein, I remain against the level of development proposed especially on land beyond the settlement boundaries and believe that this will create a dangerous precedent around Lavant and in the National Park generally. I also believe that insufficient attention has been given to landscape considerations in selecting areas for development and that the impression of the Park at its southern gateway will be detrimentally affected by the proposals.</p> <p>Page 28 6.04 <u>The existing football pitch should be designated as Local Green Space.</u> It is much safer and more convenient location for users than the alternative proposed.</p> <p>LNDP 21 Policy LNDP 21 for housing development and a replacement football pitch should be deleted, as it conflicts with many other policies such as LNDP 1,2,3,5,6,10,11,12,14 and 17 and the South Downs core principles and policies. This proposal will not achieve much, if any, affordable housing because of the need for it to reflect the low density of the surrounding area. There are impracticalities in seeking to assimilate housing and engineering works for a new football pitch into</p>	<p>Comments noted, but incorrect. SDNPA 20 is an allocation not based on need. SDNPA 20 is an allocation that is not based on Lavant Housing need. As there was no identified requirement we were encouraged at the outset to carry out a Housing Needs Survey and this identified the numbers used in the plan. 75 is our target based on that survey and is somewhat lower than the new dwellings build over the past 15 years.</p> <p>Q1b There is no intent within the plan to expand beyond the built perimeter of Lavant. In Pook Lane this is defined by Raughmere drive albeit outside the Settlement Boundary this is the limit of the SDNP. At the Public Inquiry for the <i>Daffodil Field</i> this was the agreed demarcation of the southern extent of Lavant.</p> <p><u>Page 28</u> . As private land there is no security of tenure for use of the field as a football pitch and there is an expressed wish to seek a solution that provides a facility in perpetuity.</p> <p>LNDP21 The need for low cost market housing to meet the objectively assessed needs of the village – primarily the younger and older age groups - is paramount, although a mix is proposed. The availability of suitable land</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(R contd)</i>	<p data-bbox="577 555 689 579">LNDP 10</p> <p data-bbox="577 627 689 651">LNDP 4</p> <p data-bbox="577 1098 689 1201">Q3 SA p17 5.25</p>	<p data-bbox="696 268 1534 475">the landscape here. The Parish and public should not be duped into thinking the western part of the site can remain adequately screened in the manner illustrated or that a football pitch with no safe access from Lavant's settlements is acceptable especially as it would impact on the landscape of the Local Gap which is of visual importance to villagers and walkers and is the setting for the historic entrenchment.</p> <p data-bbox="696 523 1489 547">The football pitch area should be designated as Local Green Space</p> <p data-bbox="696 595 1534 802">This policy should reflect the SDNPA's identified need for 20 dwellings with an emphasis on affordable homes on brown field sites. The plan should divert market pressures to areas outside the plan area, in line with the Chichester District Council approach, especially as there is plenty of new housing with a mix of dwelling sizes proposed just a short distance south of the Park in north Chichester.</p> <p data-bbox="696 1098 1534 1417">(supporting documents) Some of the supporting documents were produced well before the Pre-Submission Plan and need to be updated to reflect more recent pieces of evidence. Some of the scoring for the development sites under consideration is very dubious. For example, on Site 3 – Land Adjacent to Pook Lane – there does not appear to be any positive benefit to infrastructure from development of this site, as I believe the proposal would have a negative impact on the A286. The development of the eastern part of</p>	<p data-bbox="1556 268 2143 547">within the confines of Lavant built area is a further consideration and whilst it is important that the development does not have an adverse effect on the special qualities of the SDNP, the allocation of land where it delivers more homes (than the SDNP allowance) will be supported where it meets an identified housing need in that settlement/locality.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 555 2143 874">The proposed development of this site will be seen from the A286 (albeit some trees will be retained) as indeed are the other houses along the A286. The impact of a football pitch in the proposed new location in the 'local gap' and its impact on the setting of the entrenchment will be no greater than in its present location. The proposed safer access across Pook Lane should have significant benefits to the community.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 914 2143 1090">In the event that development of this site proves impossible to achieve within the constraints of the site specific policy it would be appropriate to designate this area as Local Community or Green Space.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 1129 2143 1201">Comments noted – it is considered that up to date evidence is being used.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 1273 2143 1417">It is accepted that there would be a loss of a football field but this is mitigated by the provision of another playing field. The proposed development would offer benefits to</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(R contd)	SA p14 - p16	<p>the site is not assessed at all, and that would most likely have a negative impact(on) most of the criteria.</p> <p>Also by only having three options in the Sustainability Appraisal under Issues A-D the options within each are too simplistic/crude. A2 and B2 should be more receptive to development on brown field sites than extensions to settlements.</p> <p>(There isn't room here so my response includes an attached document which explains in more detail why I consider the plan should be amended before submission and why I feel it is inconsistent with wider policies for housing and local landscape and the National Park).</p> <p><u>Detailed Comment on the Pre-Submission LNDP March 2016</u></p> <p>Unfortunately, I cannot attend the Extra-Ordinary LPC meeting on 9 th May and so have prepared a detailed response below.</p> <p>I appreciate that much hard work has gone into preparing the plan by volunteers who deserve much praise for their efforts to support the Parish in this task. In the past I have been a Principal Planning Officer in Forward Planning so have some understanding of the issues that have to be considered. I think there are some aspects that the planning authorities, particularly the principal planning authority for the area (SDNPA), will consider very carefully, so the Parish Council should do the same before certain aspects of this pre-submission plan are put forward any further. There are some inherent conflicts between the objectives of the plan and the policies, and between the policies themselves. Also the plan is in conflict with the South Downs Local Plan Preferred Options (September 2015) in relation to the amount of development which is appropriate in Lavant and in the National Parks generally.</p>	<p>local infrastructure – for instance there would be improved parking and traffic calming along Pook Lane and the removal of the gated access onto the roundabout. When considering scoring it is important to balance the pro's and con's in relation to each objective. On balance we consider that the proposed development would offer possible positive impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Comments Noted – it is considered that the options assessed are appropriate.</p> <p>There has been on-going dialogue with SDNPA. The PreSubmission plan has been considered very carefully and changes made as appropriate. In particular we do not believe</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 21	<p>This is clear, for example, in the selection of the site which is the subject of Policy LNDP21 for development as housing and a football pitch. I think there are many aspects of this proposal, and the housing target that leads to such sites even being considered, that are deeply worrying. I therefore object to this policy in particular and urge that it and the proposals within it be deleted. I have not been able to examine other sites put forward in LNDP22-26 so I also urge you to examine those development proposals critically too in the light of the comments below, especially if they are outside the Settlement Boundaries to see if they too set an undesirable precedent for development in the Countryside elsewhere in the Plan area and the wider National Park.</p>	that the submission plan is in conflict with the SDNPA Preferred Options in relation to the amount of development
			LNDP 22 – 26	<p>My comments are divided into 3 main sections relating to the overall housing targets, and the western and eastern parts of the site subject to LNDP21.</p>	
			LNDP 21	<p>Section A - Housing Requirements have been set much too high</p> <p>A1. Housing Requirements of the SDNPA (Principal Planning Authority for the plan area) are very much lower</p>	For the reasons referred to above the subject of LNDP21 is retained in the Submission plan. This follows reviews with SDNPA, the CDC archaeological Officer and Heritage England. Additional constraints on any development have been built into the policy as a result.
			D2	<p>The housing needs option (D2) that has been selected (75 dwellings) in the Pre-Submission document is inappropriate for a village such as Lavant in the National Park. The Consultation Report shows that there was not a clear reason to opt for this concept rather than a lower one. It is at odds with the much lower level of provision (20 dwellings) proposed by the SDNPA (the local planning authority) in their South Downs Local Plan Preferred Options (September 2015) which covers a broadly similar timescale to LNDP (ie to 2032). Option D1 rather than D2 and B1 rather than B2 from the Sustainability Appraisal for the</p>	In line with Government policy, the process for determining housing to be delivered in the National Park starts with the objectively assessed need for housing. When work started on the plan the SDNP advised that they had no assessed need for housing in Lavant, as did CDC. Thus they agreed

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(contd)		<p>LNDP would be a much more appropriate options for the housing targets.</p> <p>No other village in the South Downs of a comparable size to Lavant is proposed by the SDNPA to have more than 20 dwellings – Page 129 of SDLP Preferred Options. Only towns, or villages at least twice the size of Lavant, have been allocated significantly bigger figures in that document.</p> <p>A2. Housing Requirements of CDC (also a Planning Authority for part of the plan area) are zero</p> <p>In the Chichester District Council Rural Housing Needs Survey Report much lower amounts of housing were supported by the majority eg 20-30 dwellings for Lavant (Page 42), and people said ‘please don’t build on greenfield sites’. It is important to note too that Chichester District Council specifically identified a zero housing requirement for the CDC part (22%) of the plan area.</p> <p>A3. The South Downs National Park, by definition, is of national importance</p> <p>It has long been a principle of planning nationally that it is the planning authorities’ role in general to divert housing development to locations other than National Parks where it can be met with less detriment to the landscape.</p> <p>The National Parks Vision and Circular 2010 also states that National Parks are not suitable for unrestricted housing and suggests focusing</p>	<p>that Lavant should undertake a housing needs survey as the basis for the plan. The results of that survey were evaluated by CDC and we shared those results with SDNPA who then saw fit to make an arbitrary allowance of 20 dwellings which is barely 1 a year. This is considered to be wholly unrealistic when set against a national housing crisis. Indeed the number is caveated that * Sufficient capacity has yet to be identified in these settlements</p> <p>A2 Understandably new housing within the National Park is modest. However specifying limited housing numbers will only exacerbate housing shortages to those most in need. For example in Lavant, if the total number of houses is limited to 20 then it can be almost guaranteed that those 20 units will be designed to maximise developer returns and not match local need.</p> <p>A3 . There is a clear need for affordable and appropriate housing in Lavant (see Housing Needs Survey). LNDPSG AND LPC believe that the plan's policies should demonstrate a balance between need (this must be evidenced) and growth, looking at areas of restraint and those where appropriate</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(R contd)	LNDP 21	<p>on affordable housing. Lavant benefits in this respect from its proximity to Chichester where affordable housing can be provided if needed within a short distance. However, the conservation of the landscape remains the primary objective in National Parks.</p> <p>Summary of Section A:</p> <p><i>The housing target has been set too high and is incompatible with other objectives and policies at national, regional and local level.</i></p> <p>Section B - The Western Part of the Site in LNDP21</p> <p>B1. Brown Field Sites, not Green Sites, should be used for new development</p> <p>We should be looking for brown field sites to meet the needs for affordable housing and should not be looking at green sites outside the Settlement Boundaries. By only looking at three options under Issue A in the Sustainability Appraisal (Pages 14 and 15) the options are crude. There could have been an option not to go for extensions adjacent or abutting settlements but to consider certain brown field sites where the case is compelling.</p> <p>B2. Ignoring the Settlement Boundaries will create a poor precedent</p> <p>Settlement Boundaries for Lavant were reviewed as recently as December 2013, so why should we accept building adjacent to such a boundary so soon afterwards? This is likely to put pressure on other sites adjacent to the Settlement Boundaries in the future both in Lavant and elsewhere in the National Park. There is no exceptional circumstance such as support for the local economy, farm</p>	<p>development can be accommodated. In places such as Lavant where there are a number of appropriate sites, housing numbers should be increased in the LNDP and in the SDNPA Local Plan.</p> <p>B1 The brownfield sites in Lavant are limited in number (ie Eastmead Industrial Estate and Summersdale/Maddox Wood). The former is subject to final agreement with SDNPA on the quota that they will allow for housing (as opposed to employment) and the latter has been withdrawn and is the subject of a current planning application to retain the PFS and enlarge the retail facility.</p> <p>B2 SDNPA allow for restricted development of sites adjacent to Settlement Boundaries.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(R contd)	LNDP 1	<p>diversification or conversion of agricultural buildings in this site in relation to this site.</p> <p>LNDP1 (Spatial Strategy and Settlement Boundaries) makes this clear in part (a) particularly. The proposal in LNDP21 is not in general conformity with this plan – notably it conflicts with policies LNDP1, LNDP2, LNDP3, LNDP5, LNDP6, LNDP10, LNDP11, LNDP12, LNDP14 and LNDP17 and its Vision and Objectives.</p> <p>B3. The National Park boundary line has been ignored and the proposal will neither conserve or enhance the landscape</p> <p>The National Park boundaries were looked at carefully when the Park was created in 2010. There appears to have been a deliberate intention at that time to incorporate this site and the land to its south into the Park. Looking at a map of the National Park boundary it is obvious that it does not follow a straight line on the southern side of Lavant and takes a deliberate route further south to include an enclave at this point. LNDP2 requires that all development must conserve and where possible enhance the special qualities and essential characteristics of the National Park. The proposal for the site in LNDP21 will neither conserve nor enhance the National Park.</p> <p>The Core Policy SD1 of the South Downs Local Plan Preferred Options wants to ensure above all that development is consistent with National Park purposes. SD22 sets out a series of exceptional circumstances whereby development outside settlements may be acceptable. The policy requires robust evidence, and states that “it is of paramount importance that proposed development does not have a potential adverse effect of the special qualities particularly in regard to landscape. The introduction of urbanising forms of development into the countryside either directly or indirectly as a result of development will be strongly resisted” (SDLP Page 121, Para 7.11).</p>	<p>B3 The boundary of the SDNP which wraps around the ‘enclave’ and goes up Raughmere Drive makes visual sense as the enclave is clearly part of the Lavant settlement and not that of Chichester</p> <p>The acceptance of the site for development was contingent on a replacement football field. The rejection was based on the assumption that this was unlikely and the existing site should remain as a football field.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 21	<p>Para 9.03 of the LNDP states that development proposals should also adhere to all other planning policies, ie with the plan and with national and local planning policies for the area.</p> <p>From speaking with other residents in the village, I gather the proposals for this site are highly controversial and have a high degree of local opposition. In the Consultation Report (para 2.59) there was a 61% rejection of the site for development – the highest level of objection for the sites under consideration.</p> <p>B4. The site is the Gateway to the Park from the South</p> <p>The site is the gateway to the Park from the South, ie some of the first land within the Park as seen by people entering from Chichester. Is new development the first thing we want people to see at that point? A use with a green character and one which gives a glimpse of the Trundle beyond at the mini roundabout is surely a more appropriate welcome. It is very unlikely that the site could retain all its hedges and trees and have safe enough access to the A286. It is higher than some of the surrounding land so consequently development on it will be more visible.</p> <p>The proposal on the site in LNDP21 is in conflict with LNDP14 and LNDP1. The latter says development proposals will constitute sustainable development where they:</p> <p>“(e) do not have a detrimental impact on the predominantly open and undeveloped landscape setting of the village (which provides a gateway to the SDNP) or the National Park”. This point is also applicable to the eastern part of the site.</p>	<p>B4 Compared with the historical views, before the houses were built to the east of the A286, before the mini roundabout was constructed and the trees grew into mature specimens there was a good view of the Trundle. Today, apart from a glimpse through the field gate as you negotiate the roundabout ,the Trundle and the field in the foreground is barely visible.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		<i>(R contd)</i>	<p>LNDP 14 LNDP 1</p> <p>LNDP 5</p> <p>LNDP 6</p>	<p>B5. Density of new housing should reflect that of the immediate surroundings</p> <p>It will not be possible to build 1 and 2 bedroom affordable units on this site and still meet the objectives of LNDP5 which requires development “to reflect the scale and character of the immediate surrounding area”. The site is adjacent to properties with big gardens, ie very low density. Twelve dwellings on the existing football pitch area would be totally out of keeping with the area. LNDP6 requires “development to reflect the density of the immediate surrounding area”. If it were developed at a very low density it would then not meet the need for mainly 1 and 2 bedroom affordable housing but would be market-led.</p> <p>The pre-submission plan calls for 50% affordable housing on sites with capacity for 10 or more dwellings so there is inherent conflict between the draft policies on this point.</p> <p>B6. Impracticalities of maintaining the tree and hedge screening on all sides and in the long term</p> <p>Whilst I strongly disagree with the proposal to build at all on this site, should the proposal proceed, it would be right to seek to protect and possibly enhance the green hedges and trees around it. However, from my experience both the developers and some future home owners will want to remove existing vegetation and probably seek to replace it with a more open or structured look. Sadly, legal agreements entered into with owners, Tree Preservation Orders or landscape conditions imposed at the time of a planning application are insufficiently</p>	<p>B5 There is no expressed village desire to replicate the large houses with large gardens, many of which are not visible from the road. Indeed all the consultation responses indicate that these houses are not required nor seen as desirable by Lavant residents. To the west of the A286 and further north there are small properties along the road. POLICY LNDP 7 seeks to provide Lavant with the Affordable and smaller units required. The density is not an absolute requirement but will be determined through the design that will need to take into account the defined constraints of the site, including the need for affordable properties</p> <p>Due to responses from SDNPA and CDC this has been (reluctantly) replaced to comply with Planning Regulations.</p> <p>B6 The proper balance of landscape and open space with any buildings is important to retain. In this case the undergrowth and trees are around the perimeter only and being in the SDNP this provides another level of protection. The management of the public open space including the entrenchment to the north will be required by the statutory bodies.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(Rachel Struckett contd)	LNDP 21	<p>effective in safeguarding hedges and trees in the long term, unless the site is in public ownership – which of course has financial and on-going management considerations.</p> <p>In seeking to provide vehicle access to the site from the A286, which is not only a busy road but has a bend nearby to the north and a bus stop between that bend and the mini roundabout, much of the mature hedging and the trees along the western edge of the site would probably have to be removed to provide cars with a visibility splay, thereby exposing the new housing to the road.</p> <p>Thus the current site plan could be misread by those local residents voting, expecting that the vegetation shown would remain in-situ and hide any development inside in the long term.</p> <p>B7. LNPD21 proposal is not as sustainable as it might appear in the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>In the Sustainability Appraisal (Para 5.25) there is a table which seeks to assess the housing sites against wider objectives. Site 3 does not score well and in my opinion some of the scores should be even lower. For example, this site is assessed to have infrastructure benefits, but (assuming this means roads, which is the usual interpretation) I do not see any evidence for this and believe the reverse is true in relation to the A286. Also the site's impact on tourism (the National Park) is undoubtedly more likely to be negative than neutral if the site is developed as proposed at the gateway to the Park. In the Assessment of Potential Development Sites for the Lavant Neighbourhood Plan, it was acknowledged that development of this site would change the</p>	<p>Comments noted – The SG consider the assessments in the SA are appropriate.</p> <p>Safe access will have to be agreed with WSCC as the highway authority. With the verge between the trees and the road it should be possible to provide the proper visibility displays without the removal of too many trees. As referred to above, some of these are in a poor condition (likewise the undergrowth) and may have to be removed and so the opportunity could be taken to locate an access at that point.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			LNDP 21 Contd	<p>landscape character of this part of the village, a view with which I strongly concur.</p> <p>B8. The Western Part of the site should instead be designated as a Local Green Space</p> <p>The LNDP says that Local Green Spaces within the Settlement Boundary should not be taken for development, so why would you want to lose a Local Green Space or Local Community Space outside the Settlement Boundary either? I believe it should be a Local Green Space because of its proximity to the community it serves, its local significance, as well as its recreational value and historical significance – all criteria mentioned in Para 6.02. See LNDP10, LNDP11 and LNDP12.</p> <p>Summary of Section B:</p> <p><i>LNDP 21 (land adjacent to Pook Lane) should be deleted.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It will set a very undesirable precedent for building on green sites outside the Settlement Boundaries inside the National Park.</i> • <i>It would be detrimental to the impression of the Park at its southern gateway.</i> • <i>It will not achieve much, if any, affordable housing because of the need to reflect the low density of the surrounding area.</i> • <i>You and the public should not be duped into believing that the site can be adequately screened in the manner illustrated.</i> • <i>The Sustainability Appraisal has some dubious scoring in relation to the site, notably in relation to the infrastructure and tourism criteria.</i> 	<p>Concern noted – the site in question has been fully assessed and considered to be a suitable and appropriate location for new development. Negative impacts have been mitigated in so far as reasonable through the policy.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
		(R contd)	LNDP 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The western part of the site should be designated as Local Green Space which is a much safer and more convenient location for users than the alternative proposed in this policy.</i> <p>Section C – the Eastern Part of the Site in LNDP21</p> <p>C1. Inappropriate visual alteration and closing of the open views in the River Lavant Valley as seen from the Right of Way, meadows, and westwards from East Lavant</p> <p>LNDP3 (Local Gaps) requires that development must not diminish local green gaps “visually, perceptually or physically lead to the coalescence of settlements”. The proposal to relocate the football pitch into the open landscape of the River Lavant valley will have a detrimental effect on the openness of the Local Gap - a key landscape feature which needs to be retained. Para 4.12 says if outdoor sport is allowed in a local gap it must not have a detrimental effect on openness.</p> <p>A significant amount of hedge and tree planting would be needed and this would be to the detriment of the open nature of the valley. The proposal would have an adverse effect on the views westward from East Lavant including from New Road / Fordwater Road, as well as for walkers in the meadows beside the River Lavant.</p> <p>In time there may be pressure for changing facilities for a new football pitch, given it is the wrong side of the road from the cricket pavilion, which could lead to further pressure on the openness of the valley.</p> <p>Para 4.14 recognises that this area between Mid and East Lavant is a “physical and visual gap valued by the community”. “Visually the gap provides views to the Trundle and down into / over East Lavant”.</p>	<p>C1.. It is not considered that the recreational use of the proposed new football pitch would have a detrimental effect on the openness of this local gap. Neither would it “visually, perceptually or physically” lead to a coalescence of settlements.</p> <p>The existing hedgerow along the eastern side would be retained and would screen the pitch when looking west.</p> <p>The provision of changing facilities is not proposed. The Memorial Hall is looking at how the current facilities can be improved.</p> <p>Safe access across the road would be a priority that would have the added benefit of traffic</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>In the Detailed Assessment of Open Spaces it was also recognised to meet the criteria of a Local Gap.</p> <p>In para 7.07 it is noted that its landscape character is a special quality of the Parish. It says that development should seek to retain this wherever possible. It also wants to ensure that development should not diminish key views. The view from the footpath which runs north to Pook Lane from Chichester along the western edge of the proposed Football Pitch is one of those key views which is worth retaining. This path is well used and because of its elevation offers some of the best views of the Lavant Valley, St Mary's Church and the Trundle. The Right of Way which crosses the site in LNDP21 is well used as is THE footpath for people walking out of the northern edge of Chichester into the National Park. It is unfortunate that this Right of Way does not show up on the Printed Map for the Plan as it crosses the site in LNDP21.</p> <p>C2. The site will require a great deal of remodelling as it slopes very significantly down towards the river from the footpath and will impact on the historical setting of the Intrenchment as it runs north-south besides that Right of Way.</p> <p>The plan does not assess the impact of relocating the football pitch into the Lavant Valley. This land slopes very significantly here from the height of the Right of Way to the level of the River Lavant, so very substantial engineering work would be needed and would dramatically alter the contours and character of the Lavant Valley at this point.</p>	<p>calming along Pook Lane.LNDP21 Bullet point covers this aspect.</p> <p>Noted – the land was not considered to form part of extensive tract of land and therefore does not meet the designative requirements for a Local Gap</p> <p>It is considered that the views would not be detrimentally altered.</p> <p>C2 The main level change is along the west boundary of the field parallel to the entrenchment. The proposal is to locate the new like for like (ie not full size) football pitch along the eastern boundary on the flatter part of the site.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
			<p data-bbox="577 448 680 475">LNDP 17</p> <p data-bbox="577 1347 680 1374">LNDP 11</p>	<p data-bbox="696 268 1556 512">This will not only have a significant impact on the landscape but will impact on the setting of another part of the Pre-Roman Dyke that runs north-south along the outer eastern edge of the site at this point. It is from this point that you can appreciate how this Intrenchment relates to the Trundle (ie one tribal group seeking to defend itself from another). It thus will be at odds with LNDP17 which is concerned, interalia, with protecting the setting of Scheduled Ancient Monuments.</p> <p data-bbox="696 699 1556 762">C3. Inaccessibility of proposed football pitch from the main community in Mid Lavant and concerns about the safety of access</p> <p data-bbox="696 810 1556 1305">A football pitch on the south side of the increasingly busy Pook Lane and separated from the carpark too would be much less accessible for the community it is to serve. Assuming that the majority of young football players will be drawn from north of the site where the population is centred, it would be regrettable and potentially dangerous that, in order to access the site, players and spectators many of whom could be children would have to cross over Pook Lane. There is little visibility for crossing the road at the bottom of the hill on Pook Lane where the footpath comes out. It is not a safe crossing place unless you are quiet enough to listen as well as look for cars particularly those coming from the west – which excited children/teenagers may not be. Will this really improve the existing use and community value of the space as required by LNDP11? Certainly not throughout the week.</p> <p data-bbox="696 1347 1556 1410">The development proposal for a football pitch on the Eastern Part has not been assessed against sustainability criteria although the Western</p>	<p data-bbox="1556 304 2143 619">Discussions have been held on site with the CDC Archaeological officer who was also representing Heritage England. Provided the location of the pitch was away from the entrenchment this should not be an issue albeit that appropriate pre-construction investigations would have to be carried out. A buffer providing protection for the At Risk Monument is provided within the policy.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 735 2143 1230">C3The current crossing of Pook Lane is dangerous. The intention is to relocate the crossing towards the Memorial Hall via the north end of the propose football field. A platform will be constructed in agreement with WSCC Highways in Pook Lane to facilitate safe crossjng as well as to provide traffic calming down this stretch of road. This is included as a bullet point in LNDP21 The majority of those using the Football facility come by car from outside Lavant. Additional parking is also proposed adjacent to the Memorial Hall.</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				<p>Part (Site 3) and the individual options for the existing pitch were. If it had been it would most likely have scored negatively in most, or all but one, of the sustainability criteria.</p> <p>C4. Is it practical?</p> <p>I would also question how practical the proposals for the management of the existing Scheduled Ancient Monument (on the western part) or a new football pitch (on the eastern part) are unless a public body is prepared to take on this task and expense. Will the SDNPA, CDC or LPC have the resources in the current economic climate?</p> <p>Summary of Section C:</p> <p><i>A new pitch on the Eastern Part will have an adverse effect on the openness of the Lavant Valley gap landscape which is of considerable visual importance to villagers and walkers, as well as having an historical significance in the context of the Intrenchment. The site is a poor location for a new football pitch as it is further from Mid Lavant than the present pitch and there is no safe access to it because it is the wrong side of Pook Lane. This site does not appear to have been assessed against sustainability criteria and but would score poorly in relation to the existing land use and may not be practical.</i></p> <p>D. Conclusion</p> <p>The high level of development proposed in the Plan is not in tune with Lavant's position in relation to the National Park nor the other objectives and policies of this plan or the Local Plan for the South Downs. It should be revised downward as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>C4 Clearly the ongoing management of the Entrenchments will have to be properly managed. This has not been the case to date even when the economic climate was more favourable. Presently the Monument is at Risk, neglected and ignored by the Landowner. LPC Volunteers have begun to work to protect the Monument (they always need other residents to join them)</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The development of land located outside of the settlement boundary and in the countryside,</p>

Folio	Date rec'd	Name and organisation if relevant	Question Policy Page/Doc	Consultee Response.	Lavant Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group Comment .
				The Proposal in LNDP21 is particularly ill-advised and will undoubtedly change the landscape character when viewed from all directions. It will result in a dangerous precedent in favour of development outside settlement boundaries, which has implications for other villages in the National Park too.	will need to be in accordance with SDNP Policy and based on local need. It is accepted that the site is outside the Settlement boundary but not outside the visual boundary of the settlement. The site is generally secluded and unlikely to be visible either from the village green (it is screened by the entrenchment with an extensive change of level) or from Pook Lane (in view of the level difference and hedgerows). It will be visible from the A286 but the intention is for the development to build on the typology of houses already fronting the A286.

The following comments have been supplied by Chichester District Council in relation to areas of archaeological or historical interest. These comments should be taken into account by the Lavant NDP group. For further information or clarification please contact James Kenny, Archaeology Officer, Chichester District Council.

The proposed allocation sites all contain or are likely to contain archaeological and/or historic interest that would restrict development to some extent:

LNDP21 – This contains two Scheduled sections of Chichester Entrenchment whose physical remains and setting are highly significant and must be preserved. The western part, containing the existing playing field, has been archaeologically evaluated and demonstrated to be unlikely to contain any other significant interest; the eastern part has not been evaluated and, being closer to the river, should be considered to have a higher potential. *LNDP21 includes a bullet point 4 to directly address this concern*

LNDP22 – Several of the farm buildings have been in existence from at least the mid. 19th century, and buildings are shown in the vicinity on late 18th century maps. They are therefore likely to have archaeological and historic interest that would need to be assessed prior to redevelopment and anything of significance, including setting, might merit preservation. *Comment noted and provision made within the Policy bullet points*

LNDP23 – There is evidence that the factory units originated as a cordite factory in World War 1 and continued in use thereafter as a wood processing factory. It is possible that the buildings contain archaeological and historic interest that should be recorded prior to redevelopment. *Comment Noted*

LNDP24 – The site is crossed by the supposed line of the Roman road between Chichester and Silchester. This, and other potential archaeological interest, would need to be evaluated prior to redevelopment in order that its significance might be properly preserved. *Comment noted*

LDNP25 – The archaeological and historic interest contained in the church and its graveyard and the settings of both are highly significant and must be preserved. *This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. November 2016*

LDNP26 – The heritage significance of the ‘curio’ needs to be understood before proposals to redevelop it can be properly considered. It seems to be visible on late 18th century maps. As above reference response to SDNPA *This site has been withdrawn by Lavant Parochial Church Council. October 2016*

Of these the most significant impediments to development are the historic buildings and their settings and the Scheduled entrenchments and their settings. Of these it is the latter that is likely to be the most contentious: it is very unlikely that Historic England would be able to condone a development that impacts to the detriment of the open landscape settings of the entrenchments. Nor should we.

Comments from Chichester District Council Economic Development team are awaited. Too late

Other Comments noted for action:

1. Move map for Eastmead away from text for Maddoxwood House, as this is confusing for readers.
2. Suggest that ALL Bullets in policies need to be changed to a numerical ID eg 24.01, 24.02 etc because referencing is difficult.````